I.—WORDS OF SPEAKING AND SAYING IN THE INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.

FIRST PAPER.

In our study of semantic development no group of words can be of more pertinent interest to the philologist than those denoting articulate speech, as 'speak', 'say', 'word', 'language', and the like. If we compare the usual expressions for 'speak' and 'say' in the various Indo-European languages,[1] we find the greatest diversity; and this in spite of an extensive series of root connections among words which apply in some fashion to articulate speech. Thus the root $uequ$ (no. 18), though occurring in nearly all the main branches of the Indo-European family, has furnished the common verb for 'speak, say' in only two, Indo-Iranian and Greek, and here not exclusively or in the full tense system. There are several other roots, notably $sequ$ (no. 27), uer- (no. 37), $bh\bar{a}$- (no. 25), the application of which to articulate speech is sufficiently wide spread to make it probable that they had already developed this meaning in the parent speech, though not necessarily to the exclusion of other more original uses. In addition to this inherited variety, where the semantic development is ob-

---

[1] Bréal "Les verbes signifiant 'parler'", Revue des études grecques XIV (1901), 113 ff., has already told the story of a number of these. But, apart from differing with him on some points touching the history of the words he has chosen for discussion, the following aims at a more comprehensive and systematic study of the group, covering the usual words for 'speak' and 'say' in all the Indo-European languages.

1

scured by its antiquity, a very large number of words has developed the meaning 'speak, say' independently, some in prehistoric times, others displacing older expressions before our eyes in the historical period.   There is, of course, nothing unusual in such a change of vocabulary, but it furnishes an opportunity to observe the various sources from which the notion of 'speaking' or 'saying' may arise.

The difference between English *speak* and *say* is so clearly felt that the two words are only rarely interchangeable.   In *speak* (and *talk*) the emphasis is on the action, in *say* (and *tell*) on the content or result of the action.   One "speaks slowly", "speaks a language", the child learns "to speak", or, more commonly "to talk".   But one "says" something definite.[1] *Speak* is normally intransitive though it may take an object of the inner content as *word, language,* etc.   "*Say* is regularly transitive, requiring an object to complete the sense, though in a few phrases such as "he says so" this may be reflected by an adverb.   Indirect quotations are introduced by *say*, not by *speak*, and direct quotations also much more commonly by *say* than by *speak*.

Similar pairs of words, with substantially the same distinction as Eng. *speak* and *say*, are characteristic of most of the Indo-European languages, e. g. Lat. *loquor* and *dīco*, Fr. *parler* and *dire*, Ger. *sprechen* (*reden*) and *sagen*, etc.[2]   Yet

[1] In terms of "aspect", *speak* is "durative" or "imperfective", while *say* is "terminative" or "perfective".   In Slavic, where aspect is not a mere logical distinction, but a highly developed feature of the verbal mechanism, our *speak* and *say* are reflected by imperfectives and perfectives respectively, except where the correspondence is complicated by the peculiar Slavic adjustment of aspect to tense.   Thus OBulg. *glagolati*, an imperfective, regularly translates Grk. λαλῶ 'speak' in all tenses; while *rešti, rekq,* a perfective, regularly translates the forms of λέγω 'say', except those of the present system, which are rendered by the present of *glagolati*, since the present of the perfective has future force and is used for ἐρῶ and the non-indicative forms of εἶπον.   While, then, the imperfectives like OBulg. *glagolati*, Russ. *govorit'*, Boh. *mluviti*, etc., are essentially verbs of 'speaking' and will be so classed below, it is to be understood that in their present system they may answer to our *say* as well as to *speak*.

[2] See the tabular lists given at the end.   The juxtaposition of the two words in Luke V. 4: ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα.   "When he had left speaking, he said unto Simon", furnishes in the transla-

this situation is not universal. Thus Sanskrit forms from *vac-* and *brū-* with the corresponding Avestan forms (nos. 2, 18), and similarly λέγω and εἶπον in classical Greek, answer in use to both *speak* and *say*. And even for the majority of languages, where 'speak' and 'say' are distinguished, the idiomatic differentiation is never precisely identical, and may vary in different periods of the same language. Thus in the German of Luther's time *sprechen* might introduce an indirect quotation, which is still possible in some dialects, but no longer admissible in the literary language; and Luther's bible translation has it regularly with direct quotations (cf. no. 67, footnote), where it is still optional in the written language, but wholly displaced by *sagen* in ordinary speech. On the other hand Eng. *speak* has always been infrequent in such use (NED. IX, p. 333, 2. a), and normally requires a complement, as *thus, as follows, saying*, or the like (Eng. *he spoke and said* = Ger. *redete und sprach*).[1] The peculiarity of the differentiation in Slavic has already been mentioned (p. 2, footnote).

In most of the modern languages, whatever the earlier variety, there is *par excellence* one verb of 'speaking' and one of 'saying', as Fr. *parler* and *dire*. But in some there are also other verbs which, though not without their own idiomatic restrictions, are yet in such general use as to have scarcely less claim to be reckoned as verbs of 'speaking' and 'saying'.

---

tions a convenient orientation of the usage of a given language,—but one that often requires correction, owing to the frequent retention in biblical language of words which are no longer the current expressions, and to the fact that the difference in tense is occasionally a disturbing factor.

[1] In general the use before a direct quotation is the least decisive criterion as to whether a given verb is one of 'saying' or of 'speaking'; and yet in languages of which only meager material is available this may happen to be the only use quotable. However, in the great majority of languages which distinguished 'say' and 'speak' it is the former which is here preferred. It may also happen that a special form is in vogue with direct quotations, especially in parenthetic use, one that is otherwise obsolete or nearly so, or even one that never has been a verb of 'saying' or 'speaking'. Cf. Lat. *inquam*, Grk. ἠμί Grk. φημί in Attic (no. 25), Eng. *quoth* (no. 67), Welsh *medd* (no. 78), and OIr. *ol* (Mod. Ir. *ar, arsa*), which is of adverbial origin (Havers, KZ. XLIV, 26 ff., with references).

And between these, what has been noted as the essential difference between *speak* and *say*, namely in their relation to the action or content respectively, may appear in a greater or less degree. Thus Eng. *talk* beside *speak* and *tell* beside 'say are in this respect, entirely aside from the familiar tone of *talk*, noticeably farther apart than are *speak* and *say*. In *talk* our feeling for the action is more acute than in *speak*, and in *tell* the relation to the content is even closer than in *say*. Neither *talk* nor *tell* may introduce a direct quotation, which is the use in which *speak* and *say* most nearly approach one another. Similarly Ger. *reden*, which has encroached upon *sprechen* far more than Eng. *talk* upon *speak*, has left *sprechen* in an intermediate position beween *sagen* and *reden*, and between Eng. *say* and *speak*, as may be roughly represented as follows:

Eng.   *tell*   *say*   *speak*   *talk*

Ger.   *sagen*   *sprechen*   *reden*

In a somewhat different way OE. *cweđan* is intermediate between *secgan* and *sprecan*, and Lith. *tar̃ti* between *sakýti* and *kalbė́ti*. They are verbs of 'saying' rather than of 'speaking', but their prevailing use with direct quotations (cf. footnotes to nos. 5, 67) shows that their underlying feeling was one of closer relation to the *form* of the content than *secgan* and *sakýti*. This would be explained if they had once been true verbs of 'speaking', and for Lith. *tar̃ti* at least this is also probable by reason of its source (cf. no. 8).

The meaning 'speak' oftenest arises by specialization from the notion of 'sound, noise' as in our group I, and conversely the great majority in this group are verbs of 'speaking' rather than of 'saying', as is natural where the semantic development is within the sphere of action. In the case of other sources, which have nothing to do with the production of sound, the application to speech being absorbed from the context, intransitive meanings like 'reason', 'think', 'consort with', etc. (cf. groups IV and V) naturally lead to 'speak', while notions like 'make clear', 'make known', 'put in order', 'bring forth', etc. (cf. groups II, III, and part of VII) gen-

erally lead to 'say', since here the semantic shift is due to similarity of result.

Yet, while the observation of such a relation between the distinction of 'speak' and 'say' and their respective sources is important, it obviously is not one to be pressed. We have noted that the distinction is of variable definiteness, and even non-existent in the case of several verbs, especially those of Indo-Iranian and Greek in the early period. It is not surprising that similar sources may occasionally yield both meanings, or that what is properly a verb of 'speaking', as defined above, may become one of 'saying', and conversely. Thus Eng. *talk* and *tell* are at opposite extremes in point of aspect (cf. above, p. 4), but are from the same root (no. 64). Observe the contrast of Grk. φημί with Lat. *fārī*, etc., and also with φωνή (no. 25). The Celtic verb of 'speaking' became the verb of 'saying' in Cornish and Breton (no. 11). So one need not scruple to assume a similar shift of meaning where there is no such direct evidence. Cf. also, above, p. 4.

It is a frequently observed phenomenon that a word which is first applied to speech only in a depreciatory sense, 'chatter', 'jabber', 'prate', etc., may lose this and become merely familiar in tone, as in Eng. *chat*, which is only a shortened form of *chatter*, but is now differentiated from it in feeling; and again that a word denoting familiar speech (whether or not this rests upon an earlier depreciatory sense) may lose this special coloring and become the ordinary prosaic word for 'speak'. Eng. *talk*, though the notion of informal, familiar speech is dominant, and even a depreciatory sense evident in certain phrases, is also used without any such feeling, and colloquially it is a growing rival of *speak*. The child " learns to talk", one may "talk French", and "he talked well " or "what did he talk on?" may refer to the most dignified and formal address. But the process referred to would be complete only if *talk* replaced *speak*, or at least became its full equivalent. In some of the German dialects *schwatzen* is said to be used in place of *reden*. A complete sequence from the 'chatter' of animals to the 'chatter' of human beings, to 'chat, talk familiarly', and finally to simple 'speak' is spread before us in the history of Grk. λαλέω (no. 10), which after reaching the final stage was overtaken and driven from

the standard language by another verb, which had started with 'consort with, chat', namely ὁμιλέω (no. 47). There are numerous other illustrations in the material given below, e. g. under nos. 3, 4, 6 (Lat. *garrio*), 8, 42, 44, of the interchange, in the same form or in cognate forms, of 'speak' with 'chatter' or 'chat'. And probably many others, perhaps most of those in group I, have passed through the meaning 'chat' or the like as the last intermediate stage in their development.

A factor of first importance in changes of vocabulary, as is well known in general and is equally evident in the group we are studying, is the fondness for new and picturesque expressions, and the tendency to replace the familiar and commonplace words by such, until they in their turn lose all special coloring and are ready to be displaced by others. We sometimes think of this as an especial attribute of slang, because here it runs riot, untrammeled by the conservative influence which operates in the literary language. And it is indeed not to be supposed that our ancestors in pre-literary periods were ever so uniformly opposed to using an ordinary word in its ordinary sense, or so resourceful in coining new expressions, as our modern youth.[1] But in the long centuries before the rise of literary languages and the consequent (relative) standardization of speech within larger areas, there was no such thing as slang or colloquial speech, by contrast to anything else, for all language was of this character.

The great variety in the words for 'speak' and 'say' in the Indo-European languages is in large part due to changes of vocabulary which took place in their prehistoric periods, or else in periods when a standard language was in a decline and had relaxed its pressure. Under the latter head would fall the changes which took place in the later periods of Greek, and of Latin before the standardization of the present Romance languages. In Latin, *fābulor* was the colloquial word

---

[1] The same exaggeration of a natural tendency shows itself in certain styles of writing. Not to mention the highly developed jargon of baseball reporters, some of our story writers, as was remarked by a correspondent in the New York Nation, Oct. 9, 1913, "dread the sight of the good old word 'said' as a hydrophobic patient dreads water". They prefer "scorned", "denied", "greeted", "chatted", "defended", "husked" (!), "dryly thanked", "faintly surrendered", "fondly remembered" (all these following direct quotations).

for 'speak' from the time of Plautus, but *loquor* was so strongly intrenched in the language of literature and of cultivated speech that it was not until the standard Latin had lost its hold on the speech of the Roman world that *loquor* was definitely ousted by *fābulor*, which was itself displaced in France and Italy. Cf. nos. 54, 55. There have been comparatively few such substitutions in the regular words for 'speak' and 'say' in the modern languages since they gained the position of "standard" languages with their increasingly dominant influence, never so strong as at present. But how great a diversity may exist within a narrow field, where a strong centralizing force is lacking, is shown by the situation in the Rhaetoroman dialects, where the favorite expressions for 'speak' represent, apart from mere phonetic variations, seven different words.[1]

In spite of the great diversity in our group as a whole, there are some noteworthy instances of conservatism, as the agreement of all existing Germanic languages in the verb of 'saying', the persistence of Lat. *dīco* in all the Romance languages, the continued use of λέγω and εἶπε for some twenty-five hundred years, to which one should add a few hundred for εἶπε, or in reality a few thousand since its agreement with Skt. *avocat* shows that its use dates back to the parent speech.

As already intimated, the following survey aims to cover primarily the usual words for 'speak' and 'say' in the Indo-European languages, those which are in common use at some period with the same general scope as Eng. s*peak* and *say*. In this it may claim to be fairly exhaustive. On the other hand, to collect from the various languages all the expressions which in certain connections denote speech, as Eng. *point out, observe, disclose, unfold, present, maintain, reason,* etc., or even those which have come to apply almost or quite exclusively to speech, without having the general scope of 'speak' or 'say', as Eng. *mention, declare, utter, discourse, relate, recite, explain, express, address, dispute, argue, debate, state,* etc., or again those which differ from *speak* mainly in their emotional value (depreciatory or merely familiar), as Eng. *chatter, chat, prattle,* Ger. *schwatzen, prahlen, plaudern,* etc.—

[1] Cf. Gartner, Rhaetoromanische Sprache und Literatur, p. 254.

to note all such would be an endless task, obviously beyond the power of a single scholar, and would furthermore result in an unmanageable bulk of material. Yet such words have covered part of the road which might easily lead to the complete evolution of a new verb of 'speaking' or 'saying'; and some of them, when furnishing striking parallels for certain stages in the development of the regular words, will be mentioned in the appropriate connection. To the charge of inconsistency in this respect I have no reply. Many examples of approximation to 'say, speak' have been deliberately passed over, but no doubt many which would have been well worth mention have been overlooked.[1]

The particular group classification adopted is the one which has worked itself out as seemingly the most convenient for presentation of the material. But no semantic classification can do justice to all points of view. Each verb has its own semantic history, and even those which have similar sources and reach the same result have not necessarily traversed the same road. For one or another intermediate stage the analogies may be quite different. I trust that criticism will be more directed to the specific treatment of a word's semantic history than to the propriety of its inclusion in a given group.

I. From Words Denoting Noise.

Words denoting some sort of noise, many of them obviously of imitative origin, are the commonest source of verbs of 'speaking', some few of which have become verbs of 'saying'. Cf. above, p. 5.

✓   1. Eng. *speak*, Ger. *sprechen*, etc.—The characteristic West Germanic verb of speaking, OE. *sprecan*, later *specan*[2] whence

[1] Verbs are cited, in general accordance with prevailing conventions, as follows: in the infinitive, for most languages; in the first person singular present, for Greek, Latin, Armenian, Albanian, Irish, Modern Bulgarian, Pamir dialects (also sometimes given for Old Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian and Lithuanian); in a root form, for Sanskrit, Avestan, and Old Persian.

[2] It is immaterial on the semantic side whether *specan* actually comes from *sprecan* (so still *NED*) or represents a collateral but synonymous root (cf. Falk-Torp, Fick III[4], and Norw.-Dän. Et. Wtb. s. v. *sprage*). The former view would not be questioned, in spite of some traces of forms without *r* on the continent, if there were any explanation of the

Eng. *speak*, OS. *sprekan*, OHG. *sprehhan*, Ger. *sprechen*,
Dutch *spreken*, is cognate with words denoting the noise, and
also the act, of bursting, cracking, and the like. Thus ON.,
Swed. *spraka*, Dan. *sprage*, all meaning 'crackle', Lith.
sprageti 'crackle', Skt. *sphŭrj-* 'crackle, rustle, rumble' and
'burst forth', Grk. σφαραγέω 'crackle, sputter, hiss' and 'be
full to bursting' (of udders); while Lat. *spargo* and numer-
ous other probable cognates [1] are used only of the act.

An especially close parallel is furnished by Eng. *crack*.
This also was an imitative word denoting primarily the noise,
but also the act, of cracking. In present standard English
both senses still appear in the noun, while the application of
the verb to noise is almost obsolete, being partly taken up by
the diminutive *crackle*. But in the dialects the verb has de-
veloped from this side a variety of meanings, among others
simply 'talk, converse, speak', e. g. *Dannie could crack awa'
to him in his ain mother tongue*, or *he could crack far glegger
in a dead language than other folk could do in a living one*
(Wright, English Dialect Dictionary, p. 764).

2. Boh. *mluviti*, Skt. *brū-*, etc.—OBulg. *mlŭva* and its de-
rivative *mluviti* mean 'noise, tumult, make a noise', translat-
ing Grk. θόρυβος and θορυβέω, e. g. Mark V. 38, 39. The verb

---

exceptional loss of *r*. For this, one possibility which has not been con-
sidered is that it originated in occasional instances of dissimilatory loss
when *sprecan* was preceded or followed by other words containing *r*.
Such dissimilatory loss, though more familiar within the limits of a
single word (Ital. *Federico* for *Frederico*, Grk. dial. φατρία for φρα-
τρία, etc.) may also occur between words of a phrase, e. g. *die betef-
fenden* (*betreffenden*) *Professoren* (Meringer, Aus dem Leben der
Sprache 95), ἐγ Μυρίνης στατηγός (στρατηγός), Σωστάτην (Σωστράτην)
Σωστράτου, and other like cases in Greek inscriptions, too numerous to be
accidental (Nachmanson, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der altgriech. Volk-
sprache, 6 ff.). Lapses of this latter class, subject to the special context,
are obviously less likely than those of the former class to affect perman-
ently the form of a word; but that this may now and then result is
not to be denied. Cf. G. Paris, Mélanges linguistiques I. 129, footnote,
and Nachmanson, loc. cit. In suggesting the possibility that *specan*
might have originated in this way, I am unable to point to any es-
pecially frequent phrases to support it or to find any confirmation in
the earliest passages containing *specan* which are quoted.

[1] Cf. Falk-Torp, loc. cit., Walde Lat. Et. Wtb.² s. v. *spargo*, Per Pers-
son Beiträge zur idg. Wortforschung 868.

came to mean 'speak' in West Slavic, as Boh. *mluviti* and Pol. *mowić*, the usual verbs of speaking, and UWend. *molwić*, now used only in compounds. The same root is seen in Skt. *brū-*, Avest. *mrū·* 'speak, say', which supply the present system of *vac-* (for Avestan, cf. especially Yasna 19. 10 where pres. *mruye* is used in conjunction with perf. *vaoče* and fut. *vaxšyeite*).

3. Russ. *govorit'*, etc., OPers. *gaub*.—OBulg. *govorŭ* means 'noise, uproar', cognate with Lith. *gauju* 'howl', Skt. *jóguve* 'shout, proclaim', Grk. βοή 'cry, shout', βοάω 'shout, roar, call'. The derivative verb *govoriti* has become the usual verb of speaking in Russian (*govorit'*), Serbo-Croatian (*govòriti*), Slovenian (*govoríti*), Bulgarian (*govorja*: but see no. 57) ; also in Slovakian (*hovorit*), though in Bohemian *hovořiti* is 'chat, talk', more familiar than *mluviti*.

Russ. *gutor, gutorit'*, formed from a *t*-extension of the same root, are colloquial expressions for 'chat, talk', and the verb is frequently used for simple 'speak' in Little Russian (*hutoryty*) and Slovakian (*hutorit*).

What is probably also the same root in an extended form is seen in OPers. *gaub-*, which occurs only in the middle, in the sense of 'call oneself, declare oneself for' and is the source of Pahlavi *gōwēd* 'says', *gōwišn* 'word', and Mod. Pers. *guftan* 'say' (to which belongs *gap* 'word, joke', whence Pamir *gap* 'word, saying'). For the *b*-increment Meillet, Mem. Soc. Ling. XI, 183, compares OPruss. *gerbt* and Lith. *kalbéti* (see nos. 6, 7). One may also recall the considerable group of Greek words for sound in -βος, as θόρυβος, κόναβος, ὄτοβος, etc. (Sturtevant, Class. Phil. V, 327 ff.).

4. OBulg. *glagolati*.—OBulg. *glagolŭ* 'word', whence *glagolati* 'speak' (Russ. *gologolit'* 'prate'), is a reduplicated formation (**golgolo-*) from the same root as OBulg. *glasŭ* 'voice' (**golso-*), Russ. *golos* 'voice', ONorse *kalla* 'call', OE. *ceallian*, Eng. *call*, Welsh *galw* 'call', etc.

5. OPruss. *billīt*, Lith. *bylóti*, Skt. *bhāṣ-*.—In the Old Prussian texts *billīt* is the word regularly employed to translate *sagen* and *sprechen* (but not *reden*) of the German original, the latter occurring much more frequently, especially before direct quotations (cf. above, p. 3). In sixteenth and seventeenth century Lithuanian texts *bilti* and *byloti*, now

obsolete, are in common use in the same sense.[1] Cf. also
Lett. *pi-bilst* 'speak to, address', *at-bilda* 'answer', etc.   The
root is that of Lith. *bàlsas* 'voice', ONorse *belja* 'roar, bellow',
OE., OHG. *bellan*, Ger. *bellen* 'bark', Eng. *bell, bellow*.   And
from this same root (with *s* as in Lith. *bàlsas*, and change of *ls*
to *ṣ*) come Skt. *bhaṣ-* 'bark' and *bhāṣ-* 'speak, talk', *bhāṣā*
'speech, language'.

6.   OPruss. *gerdaut, gerbt;* LWend. *groniś*, Polab. *gornēt.*—
OPruss. *gerdaut*, which is used four times to translate *sagen*,
apparently where this is especially formal or emphatic (e. g.
perarwi as gerdawi iūmans=warlich ich sage euch; cf. also
po-gerdaut 'predigen'), is most closely related to Lith. *gerdas*
'cry', *girdéti* 'hear' (cf. no. 21, footnote), and *garsas* 'sound'.
These contain *ger-d-*, while OPruss. *gerbt* 'speak, recite' (it
translates *sprechen* with a direct object as *Gebetlein*, etc.) is
from *ger-b-*, both being extensions of a simple root *ger-*, from
which is formed OBulg. *grano* 'formula, verse', LWend.
grono 'speech', and from this noun the usual verbs of 'speak-
ing' in LWendish (*groniś*) and Polabian (*górnėt*).   The

[1] Thus in the catechism of 1547 *kaipo Schwentas Pawilas bila=*
OPruss. *kāigi Swints Pauli billē =* Ger. *wie Sanct Paulus sagt, ba bila
raschtas* 'for the scripture saith' *pateri bilati* 'to say the pater
noster', *bilodamo* 'saying', etc.   (For *sakýti* in this text, cf. *kure
euangelium saka* 'who proclaim the gospel', *jag teisibe mili sakau*
'that I call the truth dear', *asch sakau jog* . . 'I say that . .'.   In
Bretkun's and in Willent's translations, from the last of the sixteenth
century, *bylóti* (or *bilti* in the present) is by far the most usual verb
with direct quotations.   It is often defined wrongly by 'reden', for
which *kalbéti* (no. 7) is the regular word in these early texts, as later.
The verb *tar̃ti* (no. 8) is also common enough in the early texts,
nearly always with direct quotations, but occasionally followed by *iog*
introducing an indirect statement.   After *bylóti* became obsolete, *tar̃ti*
remained as the normal and almost universal expression with direct
quotations, as it appears, for example, in the poems of Donalitius, and
still in Kurschat's version of the New Testament.   During all this time
sakýti (no. 27) was in common use for 'say' followed by an indirect
statement or in phrases like 'what is said', etc.   But with direct quota-
tions its use was exceptional and mostly where one can detect an em-
phatic force, especially in *àsz jùms sakaū* 'I say unto you', which is
constant at all periods, and in imperative forms.   Cf. below, no. 27,
and no. 67, footnote.   Now, however, *sakýti* has come into general use
even with direct quotations, and *tar̃ti* is, if I am not mistaken, vir-
tually obsolete in the spoken language.

same root, I. E. *gu̯er-* (also *ger?*), appears in Lith. *girti* 'praise', Skt. *járate* 'crackle, roar, sound', *grṇắti* 'sing, call', OHG. *queran* 'sob', perhaps OIr. *bríathar* 'word' (cf. Stokes, Fick II [4]. 183) ; and a collateral *ĝar-* of similar meaning in Lat. *garrio*, Grk. *γῆρος*, and OIr. *gáir* 'cry' to which correspond Welsh *gair*, Cornish *gêr*, Breton *gér*, all meaning 'word'. For further cognates, cf. Walde. Lat, Et. Wtb.[2] s. v. *garrio* and Berneker, Slav. Et. Wtb. s. v. *gorno*. The Ossetan verb of speaking, *jūriṇ* (whence *jịrd* 'word'), is also, perhaps, connected. Cf. Wsewolod Miller, Grd. d. iran. Phil. I. Anh., p. 59.

Here may be mentioned also the ultimately related (*grē-grō-*, *grā-*) OE. *crāwan* 'crow', Lith. *gróti* 'croak', Russ. *grajat'* 'crow, croak', to which corresponds in Serbo-Croatian not only *gràjati* 'croak', but also *grájati* 'speak'.

7.　Lith. *kalbéti.*—Lith. *kalbù, kalbéti,* the regular verb of 'speaking', and *kalbà* 'speech, language' are from an extension of the root seen in Lith. *kalada* 'cry, noise', OPruss. *kelsāi* 'sie lauten', Grk. *κέλαδος* 'noise, din, shout', *καλέω,* Lat. *calo, clāmor,* etc.

8.　Lith. *tar̃ti.*—Lith. *tariù, tar̃ti* 'say'[1] is connected with OPruss. *tārin* 'voice', Russ. *torotórit'* 'chatter, prattle', Skt. *tāra-* 'piercing' used especially of sound, 'loud, shrill', but also of light 'shining, radiant', Grk. *τορός* 'piercing', used of the voice, speech, eye, etc., *τορέω,* usually 'pierce' in the literal sense, but once (Ar. Pax 381) *τετορήσω* 'cry out'. In this group the notion of sound is plainly secondary, arising in a special application of 'piercing', this being one of the meanings of the wide-spread root *ter-* (or roots; cf. Walde, Lat. Et. Wtb.[2] s. v. *termen* and *terō*).

9.　East Iran. *hvan-.*—In that one of the new languages brought to light by the discoveries in Chinese Turkestan which is often called "Nordarisch,"[2] but which is an East Iranian language, 'speak, say' is regularly expressed by forms of *hvan.*[3] In one of the Pamir dialects (Wachi) likewise

---

[1] Cf. footnotes to nos. 5 and 67.

[2] Leumann's "Unknown Language II", later "Nordarisch". Cf. especially Leumann, Zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur, and Reichelt, Idg. Jahrbuch I, 20 ff., 75 ff.

[3] Cf. Leumann, op. cit., 143; S. Konow, Ber. Berl. Akad. 1912, 1135.

the verb of 'saying' is *xanam*.[1] Cf. also Ossetan *xonin* 'call,
name', Mod. Pers. *xvāndan* 'call, read', Sogdian γwn- 'announce', Baluchi *vānag* 'read, recite'. All these Iranian
forms are cognate with Skt. *svan-* 'sound, resound', Lat.
sono.

10. Hellenistic Grk. λαλέω.—Grk. λαλέω, of imitative origin
like Ger. *lallen*, Eng. *lull*, *lullaby*, is used: 1) of the inarticulate sounds of animals, sometimes directly contrasted to human
speech, as in Plutarch of dogs and monkeys λαλοῦσι μὲν οὗτοι,
φράζουσι δὲ οὔ,—2) oftener of human speech, but in the classical period always either in a depreciatory sense 'babble,
chatter', sometimes directly contrasted with λέγω, as λαλεῖν
ἄριστος, ἀδυνατώτατος λέγειν (Eupolis, quoted by Plutarch Alcib.
13), or merely familiar 'chat, talk', as frequently in Aristophanes. In Hellenistic Greek λαλέω loses its special coloring
and becomes the normal verb of 'speaking'. It is used constantly in the New Testament, e. g. ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν 'when
he had left speaking' Luke V. 4; ἐλάλησε ὁ κωφός 'the dumb
spake' Math. IX. 33; ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος 'while he yet spake'
Mark V. 35. It remains the usual verb of speaking down
through the mediaeval period, but in Modern Greek, except in
certain dialects, it has given way to (ὁ)μιλῶ (no. 49).[2]

11. OIr. *labraim*, etc.—The Celtic verb of 'speaking' is:
OIr. *labraim*, with deponent inflection (e. g. *ní labrathar* 'non
loquitur' in the Priscian glosses), Mod. Ir. *labhraim*, Manx
loayrt, Welsh *lleferu, llefaru*. But in Cornish and Breton the
corresponding verbs (Corn. *leverel*, Bret. *lavaret*) mean 'say',
rather than 'speak', which is expressed otherwise (see nos.
46, 69). There is no generally accepted etymology.[3] But the
root *lab-* is doubtless of imitative origin, and may be best
compared with that of Russ. *lepetat'* 'babble, stammer', Skt.
lap- 'chatter, talk' (this is an old comparison, e. g. in Williams

---

[1] Cf. Shaw, Jour. As. Soc. Beng. XLV, 170 ff. (*xattei* 'said' frequent),
Geiger, Grd. d. Iran. Phil. I. 2, 328, 330. This is only one of many
striking points of agreement between the new language and the Pamir
dialects.

[2] Cf. especially Dieterich, Rhein. Mus. LX, 229 ff.

[3] Cf. Stokes, Fick II⁴, 239 (Low Ger. *flappen*), Z. f. kelt. Phil. III,
442 (Ger. *plappern*, Eng. *blab*), V. Henry, Lex. étym. du bret. mod. s. v.
lavar (λαβρός, λαβρεύομαι), Pedersen, Verg. Gram. der kelt. Sprachen
(Lat. *labrum* or with Stokes).

Lexicon Cornu-Brittanicum), Gypsy *lav* 'word', Mod. Pers. *labīdan* 'talk foolishly, boast', Afghan *lavdạl* 'say, declare', Pamir dial. *lewam* (Sarikoli), *lūwan* (Shigni) 'say, speak'. The variation in vowel and consonant, which in the case of such imitative words need not be taken too seriously, is similar to that seen in the words for 'lip', L. *labium, labrum,* OE. *lippa,* etc., (the Germanic forms from *leb-*), Pahlavi *lap,* Lith. *lúpa*; and it is not unlikely that the two groups are ultimately connected (compare the often assumed, though very doubtful, connection of OIr. *bél* 'lip' with Goth. *qipan* 'say', and the frequent identity of 'tongue' and 'speech, language').

12. Lat. *loquor.*—According to one of the oldest, and still the most probable etymology, Lat. *loquor* 'speak' is connected with Grk. λάσκω, ἔλακον. This is used of inanimate things 'ring, crash', of animals 'shriek, howl', and later also of men 'shout, scream', whence its commonest use in the Attic poets, especially Euripides, 'utter, announce, tell'. Although never perhaps entirely colorless, it has gone a good part of the way which must be assumed for Lat. *loquor:*

13. Arm. *xōsem.*—The regular verb of 'speaking' in Armenian is *xōsem,* OArm. *xausem.* This points to IE. *qhauk̂-* (or *q̯hauk̂-*), which is best taken as an imitative root and compared with the similar, though not identical, Grk. καυχάομαι 'speak loud, boast', Lith. *kaŭkti* 'howl' and *szaŭkti* 'cry, call out, name'.[1]

14. Grk. μῦθος, μυθέομαι, French *mot.*—In Homer μυθέομαι is one of the several frequent expressions for 'speak, say' which are later replaced by λέγω, and μῦθος, from which it is derived, means simply what is spoken, 'word, saying, story', the specialization to story in the sense of 'fiction, myth' being later. This is derived from an imitative *mu,* from which has developed in one class of words, through the contrast to dis-

[1] The comparison with καυχάομαι is due to Pedersen, KZ. XXXIX, 335, who suggests various means of phonetic identification, with or without the inclusion of Lith. *szaŭkti.* But there is no occasion to force complete phonetic identification in imitative words of this kind. Other etymologies of Arm. *xōsem* are less probable, e. g. that of v. Petrubány mentioned by Pedersen, loc. cit., and that of Scheftelowitz, BzB. XXVIII, 282, who proposes connection with Goth. *hugjan* 'think', according to which the semantic development in Armenian would be similar to that of words in our group IV.

tinct articulate utterance, the notion of 'mute' (Lat. *mūtus*, etc.), but in another the notion of 'growling' (Lat. *mūgio*, Grk. *μυκάομαι*, etc.), or 'muttering' as in Lat. *muttio* 'mutter, mumble, speak low' and *muttum* 'a mutter, grunt. The noun *muttum* seems to have been used only in negative phrases, where 'not a mutter' was, like our slang 'not a peep', simply an emphatic 'not a word' (cf. Cornutus ad Pers. *proverbialiter dicimus, muttum nullum emiseris, id est vérbum*) ; and it was doubtless from such phrases that it emerged as a respectable word in Ital. *motto*, French *mot*, this last to be compared with the Homeric use of *μῦθος*. But there is nothing surprising in the direct transition from the notion of 'mutter, speak low' to that of simple 'speak', which seems to have begun in Latin in the case of the verb (cf. Paul. ex. Fest. *muttire loqui. Ennius*: '*Palam muttire plebeio piaculum est*'), and which we assume to have taken place in prehistoric Greek. Compare especially Lett. *runāt* 'speak' from 'whisper' (no. 66). Although *μυθέομαι* became obsolete in Attic-Ionic, not occurring in prose, *μυθίζω* remained a common expression for 'speak' in some of the Doric dialects. Cf. *μυθίσδω* in Theocritus, Laconian *μουσίδδω* in Ar. Lys. 94, 981, 1076, and Hesychius *μουσίδδει· λαλεῖ, ὁμιλεῖ*.

15. Rhaet. *tšantšer*, etc.—In some of the Rhaeto-Roman dialects the usual expression for 'speak, talk' is *tšantšer*, *tšintšar*, etc. (Gartner, Rhaetoromanische Sprache und Literatur, 254, v. Planta, Archiv für lat. Lex. XV, 396). This belongs with Ital. *ciancare* 'prate', of imitative origin (Diez, Wtb., p. 97, Körting, Wtb., no 8926).

16. Rhaet. *bajer*, etc.—In some of the Rhaeto-Roman dialects 'speak, talk' is expressed by *bajer, bajaffer*, etc. (Gartner, loc. cit., and v. Planta, loc. cit.). This is from Ital. *baia* 'jest, banter' (Fr. *baie*, Sp. *vaya*), which is probably based upon an exclamatory particle.

17. Grk. *βάζω*.—The poetical words *βάζω* 'speak, say', perf. *βέβακται*, and *βάξις* 'saying, rumor', also *βάσκω· λεγειν, κακολογεῖν* (Hesychius), are from a root *βακ-*, for which imitative origin seems most probable.

18. Skt. *vac-*, Grk. *εἶπον*.—The typical Indo-Iranian verb of 'speaking, saying', the one in most general use and common to both Sanskrit and Avestan, is from the root *vac-* (IE.

u̯equ̯), though the present system is supplied from another,
Skt. *mrū-*, Avest. *mrū* (no. 2).[1] In Greek the aorist εἶπε,
which corresponds exactly to Skt. *avocat*, Avest. *vaočaț*, has
been in common use from Homer to the present day. Cf.
also Skt. *vacas*, Avest. *vačah-*, Grk. ἔπος, all meaning 'saying,
word'; Skt. *vāk*, Avest. *vāxš*, Lat. *vōx*, all meaning 'voice,
sound' and also 'saying, word', Grk. ὄψ 'voice', Toch. *wek*
'voice'; Lat. *voco, vocāre* 'call' (whence *vocābulum* 'name',
the source of Irish *focal* 'word'), OPruss. *wackis* 'cry'
wackītwei 'call', Arm. *gočem* 'cry, roar',[2] OHG. *giwahan,
giwahannen* 'mention'.[3] It is only in Indo-Iranian and Greek

[1] In later Indic and Iranian *vac-* has been largely displaced. Indic: In
Pali *vac-* is still frequent in the passive (*vuccati* = Skt. *ucyate*) and
past tenses of the active, the present being supplied from *vad-* (no. 19).
In Prakrit also similar passive forms occur (*vuccadi, vuccaï*), but the
normal verb of saying is *kath-* (no. 58), for which ten synonymns are
recited by Hemacandra IV. 2 (cf. Pischel's edition, pp. 130 ff.)   In the
modern Indic languages *vac-* has ceased to play any role, its chief
substitutes, common to the great majority of the languages and dia-
lects, being *kah-* 'say' from *kath-* (no. 58) and *bol-* 'speak' (no. 70).
Iranian: Forms of *vač-* occur in Turfan Pahlavi and in Sogdian, and
are still in common use in the dialect of the Parsis in Yezd, Kirman,
etc., and in other "Central and Caspian" dialects. Cf. ZDMG. XXXV,
403, XXXVI, 71, Grd. d. iran. Phil. I. 2, 387, 414, Bartholomae, Zum
Altiran. Wtb. 217. In Persia proper, though the root survives in Mod.
Pers. *navāxtan* 'flatter, sing', it was displaced as a verb of 'saying'
even in the Old Persian period, namely by θah- (no. 30) and *gaub-*,
whence Mod. Pers. *guftan* (no. 3), with which belongs Kurd. *gotin*.
Baluchi *gvašag, gušag* 'say, speak' belongs with Avest. *vaš-* 'say',
which can be connected with *vač-* only by assuming variation in the
guttural series (cf. Bartholomae, Altiran. Wtb. s. v. and I⁴g. Stud.
II. 22).

[2] Hübschmann's doubt as to the connection of Arm. *gočem* with this
group (Arm Gram. I. 436), on account of its meaning, is not justified
(see below), and is not shared by others. Cf. Pedersen, KZ. XXXVI,
94, XXXIX, 396, and Meillet, Mem. Soc. Ling. XIII, 244.

[3] Of the Irish words which have often been cited as cognate, e. g. by
Stokes, Fick II⁴. 260, the forms *iarfaigim*, etc., are now recognized as
belonging to *saigim*. Cf. Strachan, Rev. Celt. XIX, 177, Thurneysen,
Handbuch der altir. Gram. 467, Pedersen, Vergl. Gram. der kelt.
Sprachen II, 608. This leaves only *faig* 'dixit', which is retained by
Walde, Lat. Et. Wtb., among the cognates of Lat. *voco*, and likewise
by Falk-Torp, Fick II⁴, 381. But the form seems to occur only once,
and must be regarded as doubtful evidence for the existence of the

that the root has furnished the regular verb of 'speaking, saying'. The more wide-spread noun, Skt. *vāk*, Lat. *vōx*, etc., means primarily 'voice', and the use of the other forms which occur outside of Indo-Iranian and Greek indicate for the parent speech a general application to the voice and to its product, speaking, calling, crying, etc. The more precise semantic source is hidden in the remote past, but it can hardly be doubted that it belongs somewhere under the general head of 'sound'.

19. Skt. *vad-*, Grk. *αὐδάω*.—In Sanskrit *vad-* is one of the common expressions for 'speak, say', but is also, especially in the older language, used more generally of sounds, e. g. in the Rig Veda of those made by birds, frogs, and inanimate objects. Grk. *αὐδή* is used of the sound of a trumpet, bowstring, etc., also of speech but with reference to the tone rather than the content; while the verb *αὐδάω* is nearly always applied to human speech, being a frequent expression for 'speak, say, call' in Homer and the later poets. Grk. *ἀείδω* 'sing' is from the same root. Cf. also Lith. *vadinù* 'call, name', OBulg. *vaditi* 'accuse'.

Several nouns denoting 'word' or 'language', in addition to those connected with verbs already mentioned, offer further illustrations of the relation between 'sound' and 'speech'.

20. Goth. *razda*, etc.—Goth. *razda* 'speech, language', the regular translation of *γλῶσσα* and *λαλιά*, OE. *reord* 'voice, speech, language' (*ic spreche mongum reordum*), ON. *rǫdd* 'sound, voice', are from the root seen in Skt. *ras-* 'roar, cry, sound'.

21. Slav. *slovo*.—The typical Slavic expression for 'word', *slovo*[1] (whence *slovar* or *slovnik* 'dictionary'), is identical in form with Skt. *çravas* 'sound, call' and 'fame, glory', Grk. *κλέ(ϝ)ος* 'report, rumor' and 'fame, glory'[2].

---

root *u̯equ* in Celtic, now that all other support is removed. Is it possibly abstracted from *iarfaigim*, after the connection of the latter with *saigim* was obscured and its meaning changed from 'seek after' to 'ask'?

[1] So in Old Bulgarian and most of the Slavic languages still; but Mod. Bulg. *rěči*, Serbo-Croat. *rječ*, from the root of OBulg. *rešti*, *rekǫ* (no. 29).

[2] The meaning 'fame, glory', though wide-spread (also Slavic in the form *slava*) is secondary, as in Lat. *fāma*. Whether the notion of

2

22. Skt. *çabda-* 'sound, noise' is also used for 'word, speech', and has furnished the common expression for 'word' in some of the modern languages of Indic, as Mahratti *çabda*, Kashmiri *shebd*.

CARL D. BUCK.

'sound' is original or derived from 'what is heard' is a difficult question. In the verb-forms the meaning is 'hear' in Indo-Iranian and for the most part in the European languages (Skt. *çru-*, Grk. κλύω, etc.; for full material, cf. Walde, Lat. Et. Wtb. s. v. *clueo*), and this is commonly given as the force of the root. Meillet, Mem. Soc. Ling. XV, 337, thinks that this belonged only to aorist forms in the parent speech, but does not state how he conceives its relation to the meaning 'be called, be known as' of the presents OBulg. *slovǫ*, Grk. κλέομαι, Lat. *clueo*. Interchange between the notions of 'sound' and its perception, 'hearing', is seen in Lith. *girdėti* 'hear' beside *gerdas* 'cry' *garsas* 'sound', etc. (no. 6), where 'hear' is clearly secondary, and in Avest. *gūš-* 'hear', OPers. *gauša-* 'ear' beside Skt. *ghoṣa-* 'noise'.

(*To be Continued.*)

II.—CAESAR, CICERO AND FERRERO.

II.

But we have reached a point in our inquiry when we must somewhat exclusively follow the greater figures of that critical time. First let us take up a few matters of Cicero and his consular year. As to the chronology of the Catilinarian speeches, when *pro Murena* was delivered by Cicero, it was in November, *after* Catil. I and II. Catiline himself had thrown off the mask in the north. It is pointless to say that Catiline hoped for Murena's conviction of *ambitus*. The only person benefited would have been the eminent jurist Servius who drew up the indictment. Ferrero has not studied *Muren. 47* with any attention, where Servius' far-reaching proposals for electoral reform are outlined.—What evidence has F. for saying (I 382) that Murena's defense was arranged for *before* the election of 63 B. C. If the election of Murena and Silanus was in July 63 (F. follows John), how are we to understand why Servius postponed his prosecution to November? Did F. even *glance* at *pro Murena*? There (§ 4) Cicero looks upon his consular year as a voyager nearing port. Still more luminous are these words (§ 78): "non usque eo L. Catilina rem publicam despexit atque contempsit, ut ea copia, quam secum eduxit, se hanc civitatem oppressurum arbitraretur.—Latius patet illius sceleris contagio quam quisquam putat; ad plures pertinet. *Intus, intus, inquam, est Equus Troianus,*" etc. No *dénouement* of incriminating documents nor Mulvian Bridge as yet. Lentulus and his fellow conspirators had not yet descended from their wooden horse.

"Cicero tried to ingratiate himself with the historical nobility" (F. I. 377)—(which we are continually told had dwindled and dwindled close to the point of extinction) of Rome.— Cicero strove for distinction before the Greco-roman world of his own generation. The following is often overlooked. Cicero, the foremost patronus of the financial class, esp. of the

publicani, was as much opposed as anyone to that movement
of *Repudiation.* In November or thereabouts, 44 B. C., look-
ing back upon the past and summing up things with the mature
vision of nineteen years later he wrote (de off. 2, 84) "nec
enim ulla res vehementius rem publicam continet [1] quam *fides*
(credit), quae esse nulla potest, nisi erit necessaria solutio re-
rum creditarum. *Numquam vehementius actum est quam me
consule, ne solveretur* (to bring about repudiation). Armis
et castris temptata res est ab omni genere hominum et ordine:
quibus ita restiti, ut hoc totum malum de republica tolleretur".
Cicero in that swan song of his reflective writing was weigh-
ing and valuing things more clearly, may I say with more
spiritual earnestness than ever before. And these words are
of quite extraordinary historical value. That year 63 then,
Cicero's consular year and that of Caesar (59) soon to follow, in-
vite us to bring into discussion however briefly a great name, viz.,
that of Theodor Mommsen. Even to place the greatest of
Roman antiquarians in juxtaposition with the rhetorical Italian
feuilletonist might seem inexcusable. But it is not altogether
inept to do so. Mommsen's delineations and the underlying esti-
mates are deeply colored by his Hegelian philosophy with its
dialectical unfolding of things and the occasional worldspirit
which like the Apis on the Nile, is sometimes revealed to a
favored generation. And indeed this side of quondam Hege-
lianism is about as tolerable as that Apis-cult of Egypt.—
Caesar is the revelation of the worldspirit: *wir neigen uns
vor ihm,* Mommsen actually wrote . . . But woe to those who
barred the path of the worldspirit. Ferrero on the other hand
with his avidity of selecting a shining mark, seeks to make
of Caesar a human being of no towering proportions, but
simply carried forward on the crest of waves which were in-
finitely stronger than he. Again F. pursues a sociological
thesis. Of course unprejudiced historiography and any full
or unbiased study of ancient tradition fare most woefully in
this programme.

It is well known that Mommsen [2] after 1850 was compelled
to seek academic work in Switzerland, being deprived of his
Leipzig chair by the conservative reaction in Germany. In

---

[1] The term συνέχει of Polybius: "is a conservative force".
[2] Then but thirty-three years old.

or during this Swiss exile he seems to have conceived the only
'popular' book about Rome he ever wrote. His heart was still
throbbing with bitter passion against everything conservative.
He injected all of these feelings into his delineation of the dis-
integrating Roman republic. Does not—we ask it candidly—
does not such injection of a personal experience vitiate gen-
uine historiography? It certainly does.—Mommsen as an
antiquarian and Mommsen as a judge of politics, Mommsen
as dominated by political convictions or sympathies—these are
virtually two distinct personalities. It is not at all necessary
to argue about it. It is quite sufficient to transcribe a very
concise anthology from his own pages, to realize his angry,
his unbalanced exaggeration. "Marcus Cicero, notorisch ein
politischer Achseltraeger".[1] Cato: "dieser junge kühle Ge-
lehrte, dem die Schulmeisterweisheit von den Lippen troff"
(155): dieser Wolkenwandler im Reich der abstrakten Moral-
philosophie (the *one* man in public life whose judgment
penetrated Caesar's political designs from the beginning)—:
" Er war unfähig einen politischen Zweck auch nur zu begreifen
... "Der Don Quixote der Aristokratie". Of the summary
execution on December 5, 63 B. C.: "Elender hat sich wohl
nie ein Gemeinwesen bankerott erklärt". Of Pompey:
" der Weg zum Thron". "Nach den unerhörten (sic) Gewalt-
samkeiten gegen den Volkstribunen Metellus". Of Pompey:
"wie nahe es ihm auch gelegt war" (by the worldspirit) "die
weisse Binde um seine Stirn zu legen". "Dieser in allem,
nur in seinen Ansprüchen nicht, ganz gewöhnliche Mensch".
" Er gehörte zu den Menschen die wohl eines Verbrechens
fähig sind, aber keiner Insubordination". "Zum zweiten
Male hatte Pompeius abgedankt". "Der ganze Herrenstand",
" Dass der politischen Astronomie zum Trotz die Weltge-
schichte weiter gieng". Angry, abusive, violently partisan cari-
catures, but not—in these ebullitions—tenable historiography.
Think of Curio, Antony, Vatinius or other servitors of the
towering Julius in their *contiones*: Mommsen in his spirit of
ferocity appears fairly as one of that company.—There is an-
other matter: Mommsen's chapter headings and summarizing
superscriptions remind a sober student of this period of that
which in technical logic is called *petitio principii*: the assump-

III, p. 168, edition of 1857.

tion as proved of that which is first to be proved. "Coalition der Praetendenten", "Pompeius and Caesar's Gesammtherr-schaft." The aim, monarchy, is good. Hence all means are commendable. What at Caesar's usurpation? Hegelianism. Mommsen, then, over and over again operates with the political conceptions, certainly with the political sympathies and antip-athies, of his recent life. To do so is not any less anti-histor-ical than Ferrero's injection of Comteism (nay of Lombroso's psychiatric valuations of Crime as well as of Genius) into the presentation of those times. We may call the first writer vio-lent and angry, and the later naïve: both are in the wrong.

But to resume our examination of concrete details. Ferrero is somewhat too positive as to the pact which Cicero's colleague Antonius is said to have made with the latter about provincial emoluments (Att. 1, 12; 13; 14). Ferrero evidently has not studied the commentary of Tyrrell, an omission which no one can afford who in our time undertakes to write the history of the moribund Roman Republic. "Teucris" certainly is not a pseudonym for Antonius himself. The silly legend about Clodia setting her cap for Cicero (Plut.) is swallowed whole by Ferrero as it is by Boissier—they will not pass over so piquant a morsel.—" Me vero nihil *istorum* ne iuvenem quidem movit unquam; ne nunc senem ".[1]

In the matter of Caesar's election as pontifex maximus the date in March (63 B. C.) acc. to Ovid Fasti 3, 419 refers not to Caesar but to Augustus; v. Peter's note. This is a good point to illustrate the reckless manner in which Dio often constructs a causal nexus by a violent *hysteron proteron* or other defiance of chronology. He has the people elect Cae-sar to that honor: Why? On account of Caesar's vote of Dec. 5, 63, whereas that pontifical election came long before. The scenting of hidden motives is a veritable passion with Dio. (cf. 37, 37.), and this again shows how hurriedly he used the materials furnished him by Livy.—It is not very easy at this stage of classical studies to throw a positively new light upon these matters. Ferrero however employs his private psycho-logical and neurological diagnosis (the skulls unfortunately are not available) as his sources of new light. From these he derives novel conceptions of characters. So of Caesar:

---

[1] Fam. 9, 26. 2.

Lombroso's son-in-law has discovered the particular spring which moved this important watch. It is a "rhythmical oscillation between prudence and impetuous energy". Once discovered, this neurotic law is far better than the ball of yarn given to Theseus by Ariadne.—"La nervosa indole di Cesare era una strana oscillazione ritmica di temerità e di prudenza". (I 376, cf. 406, 439, 448, II 42–43, 189, 250, 356, 412, 462, 473, 498).

When Balbus visited Cicero in December, 60 B. C., with communications from Caesar, what warrant has anyone (p. 440) to say that Balbus talked with Cicero on his own account? A close study of Cicero's correspondence in chronological sequence demonstrates that Caesar wished to gain Cicero's support through flattery, a most effective inducement in that quarter: we also perceive that Caesar with consummate adroitness masked the *fait accompli* of the triumvirate.

There was nothing *sudden* in the policy of Caesar's consular year. The comparison with Pericles and the Attic democracy is unmeaning to a degree. The agrarian laws both 1. and 2. (April, May) were postulated by the consistent policy which Caesar had pursued ever since he had entered public life. He it was no doubt who had drawn the bill of Rullus in 64–63, and a lex Iulia agraria now was absolutely necessary for him.

There is confusion in Ferrero as to the governor of Cisalpine Gaul in 59. In 59 Metellus Celer (husband of Catullus' Lesbia) was not proconsul there at all. He died in his own house on the Palatine (Cic. p. Caelio 59). It was in 62 that he governed there (Fam. 5, 1, 2). It was therefore not the death of Clodia's husband which made Cisalp. Gaul available for the plebiscite introduced by Vatinius. Ferrero pleases himself with the fancy that Caesar primarily was the agent of "democracy": that which is "democrazia pura" with the Italian feuilletonist, is "Coalition der Praetendenten" in Mommsen's vision. Ferrero also affirms that the success of the Triumvirate was unforeseen. Hardly so; probably Caesar, Crassus and Pompey had a fair knowledge as to how many votes in the Senate they could control. Incidentally, before we leave Caesar's land-law, how can anyone refer to the older Public domain of Rome as a form of Communism?

There are some inaccuracies in the intrigue of Caesar and
Vatinius to use the informer Vettius so as to gain or secure
lasting enmity or distrust between Pompey and the aristocracy
during Caesar's now impending proconsulate.   The only pri-
mary source is Att. 2, 24.   The transcription by Signor Ferrero
is hurried and the details are somewhat jumbled in his relation.
Vettius named Brutus *before* his own arrest, and omitted that
name in his second list.   That Caesar invited Cicero *anew*,
early in 58, when he was about to set out for Gaul to become
one of his legates there, for this statement of Ferrero's I know
not the source.—I return in all respects to Ludwig Lange
with increased admiration.   Lange's simple and singularly
exact, (though dispassionate,) and truthloving, impartial re-
lation more than ever seems to me to tower above all the
other accounts.   Crabbed, venomous and grotesquely unfair
is Drumann, with all the micrology of his detail, e. g. 5, p.
605: "Unverkennbar (sic) erwartete er nur den günstigen
Zeitpunkt, Caesars Abgang nach Gallien, um Philippiken
anzustimmen; aber Caesar erfasste ihn, der auf seine Kosten
(sic) nochmals einen fünften December zu feiern gedachte,
in der Republik nur sich selbst[1] *liebte, und, gleich unfähig
zum Erhalten und zum Zerstoeren* [an impediment then at
least to those who wished to destroy] *nur andern laestig
wurde,* mit seiner eisernen Hand und warf ihn zu Boden: dann
gieng er nach Gallien ".

If anything in History is manifest, clear, impressive and
beyond controversy, it is the endowment and the comparative
nobility of the larger traits of character in Aurelia's only son.
The factitious and fatuous efforts of Ferrero to reduce Caesar
to the level of the common or the commonplace, remind me
of a single tide of the sea, and the transitory pattern which *it*
makes on the sands of time and of human story.   It roars
bravely and churns or mats the billions of grains with sovereign
power, but its effects last not for even a watch of the night.

Ferrero's ambition, both for his general thesis and for the
rewriting of Caesar's Commentarii has tempted him to
snatch with avidity at monographs like those of Rauchenstein
on Caesar's Helvetian campaign.   Why not also simply deny

[1] Cicero was one of the most consistently and resolutely grateful men
in history.

the actuality of Marius' victories over Cimbri and Teutons?
These seem to me to afford approximately the same material
for negation or doubt. The fait accompli is the umpire of
all this sort of pseudo-scholarship. But Rauchenstein-Ferrero
have been answered somewhat beyond their deserts by T. Rice
Holmes in Class. Quarterly 1909, 203 sqq. Why κύνα δέρειν
δεδαρμένην? Why indeed? " It is dangerous to mate scepticism
with imagination: for the offspring thereof will be illegitimate
fiction ".... After the fall of Alesia (52 B. C.) when the im-
pending consulate of Marcus Marcellus and many other things
and mutations in Rome—among them the unmistakable how-
ever guarded drifting away of the other dynast from Caesar's
interests and concerns—were rising with portentous serious-
ness before the political vision of Caesar, *this* I hold was the
point of time [1] when the latter conceived the design of this
publication. The majority of special students agree in this
matter with Schneider rather than with George Long. Caesar
knew well the aims of most of his political antagonists, to
most of whom indeed he had become the *bête noire* of exist-
ence. They had endeavored to entangle him with Catiline,
they had striven almost immediately after the beginning of
58 B. C. to undo his consular legislation . . ; would so rich a
field as his long *imperium* in Northwestern Europe have been
neglected by them, provided he had come to Rome once more
as a private person into the purview of the *quaestiones* whose
panels had been so largely reconstituted by Pompey? And
in any trial, be it for *maiestas* or for *repetundarum*, it would, I
believe, have been Caesar's own *Lex Iulia Repentundarum*
defining and curbing and limiting provincial government as
never before, with the financial final accounts in triplicate—
this very statute drawn by Caesar himself, I say, would prob-
ably have been the keen instrument by which men like Domi-
tius, Cato, Bibulus, the Marcelli and others would have sought
his destruction. In that last sultry period, before the break-
ing of the storm of civil war, details or any minor questions
of precision in the long story of that *imperium* were negligible
or evanescent to the deeper sentiments held by public men in
that crisis.

The larger aspects, such as the justification of entire cam-

[1] Annals of Caesar p. 266 sqq.

paigns, the enormous emoluments of these latter poured into the political game [1] at Rome—*these* I am convinced would have appeared in the indictment and in the trial. And it is this, I believe, which was in the soul of the nobler Iulius, when, accompanied by his young staff-officer Asinius Pollio he strode among the dead on the field of Pharsalos, and uttered these words with a sigh [2]: τοῦτο ἐβουλήθησαν, εἰς τοῦτό [3] με ἀνάγκης ὑπηγάγοντο (better ὑπήγοντο), ἵνα Γάιος Καῖσαρ ὁ μεγίστους πολέμους κατορθώσας, εἰ προηκάμην τὰ στρατεύματα, κἂν κατεδικάσθην.—And this consistent partisan bitterness of the times is preserved for us in a passage, which, originally, may have been penned or elaborated in contemporary writers or pamphleteers like Tanusius Geminus, Actorius Naso, Ampius Balbus or Caecina.

" Nec deinde ulla belli occasione, ne iniusti quidam ac periculosi abstinuit, tam *foederatis* quam infestis ac feris gentibus *ultro lacessitis*, adeo ut senatus quondam legatos [4] ad explorandum statum Galliarum mittendos decreverit etc. (Sueton 24).

Another point : the capital was *not* kept very well informed as to Caesar's operations; we may go further and say that the majority had no very great curiosity in the premises. Cicero's correspondence shows that. It is only when the *legatio* of Quintus and his own new support of Caesar's interests (cf. de prov. cons.) fills him with a special concern, that these campaigns figure at all. Ferrero treats all these things somewhat in the fashion in which a modern journalist might deal, say, with the bulletins arriving from the Boer wars and discussed with due continuity by the organs of public opinion in London or Paris. " Caesar received couriers from Rome daily ": not at all: hence the large *bundles* [5] of letters which of course covered quite a period of time. The creation of a " plutocratic class " among the Kelts, is an affirmation by the author. The belief that Gaul was " pacata ", at the end of the

[1] As instruments of Ambitus.

[2] Plut. Caes. 46.

[3] Cf. Die Historische Schriftstellerei des C. Asinius Pollio, by *Kornemann*, Teubner, 1896. p. 684. Where however in the further relation the two words ῥωμαιστί and ἑλληνιστί should be transposed in the text.

[4] This from Tanusius, cf. Plut. Caes. 22.

[5] Ad Q. Fratr. 2, 12, 4: Sed ille scripsit ad Balbum, fasciculum illum epistolarum, in quo fuerat et mea et Balbi, totum sibi aqua madidum redditum esse . . . .

Belgian campaign or late in 57 B. C. (B. G. 3. 7.) furnishes
F. material for one of his numerous houses of cards, viz. that
Caesar with great audacity executed "annexation" of Gaul,
and that he had endless troubles subsequently with "public
opinion" in Rome, because risings occurred continually . . . . ,
or that he wished (II 48) to re-establish his credit which had
suffered severely through the performances of Clodius.—The
passage in Dio 39, 25 is misunderstood by Ferrero. We may
go further and say that Dio made an utterly misleading infer-
ence. The matter really before us is the *Ten Legati* whose
appointment symbolized the *fait accompli* of a new province
calling for permanent organization and administrative settle-
ment.[1] Dio: (as though the results were not really accepted
by the senate too) καὶ ὁ δῆμος, τά τε κατειργασμένα αὐτῷ θαυμάζων,
ὥστε καὶ ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς ἄνδρας ὡ s κ α ὶ ἐ π ὶ δ ε δ ο υ λ ω μ έ ν ο ι s π α ν-
τ ε λ ῶ s τ ο ῖ s Γ α λ ά τ α ι s ἀ π ο σ τ ε ῖ λ α ι. When one studies
Dio's relation of the Gallic wars patiently and in detail, one
reaches the conclusion, that he selects or passes over, contracts
or expands, *ad libitum*, but that he has no other record than
Caesar himself; that he freely pragmatizes or even dramatizes
sometimes (e. g. 40, 6, Ambiorix), but that otherwise he merely
gives us a ratiocinative and analytical rewriting of Caesar's
account. Dio, Suetonius and Plutarch have the item of Cae-
sar's cryptogram or cipher (perhaps derived from Oppius),
which of course does not occur in Caesar's own memoirs (cf.
Dio 40, 9. w. Sueton. 56.). While Dio reserves for himself
the freedom of absolutely no restraint or self-limitation in
digging or delving for motives, he is very negligent (to put it
mildly) in presenting his Livian data in some fair chronologi-
cal sequence. The final naval battle with the Veneti Dio (39,
42) relates with the lively fancy of a historical novel—Apart
from the computation, and, we must add, apart from the im-
putation of motives and a certain coordination of data (often
worthless through chronological confusion) it is indeed the
height of *naïveté* to "control" Caesar's Commentarii by Dio,
as Ferrero did and that too at second hand through a mono-

[1] Cf. Annals of C. 112, 12 Phil. 28. Fam. 1, F. 10 (of 56 B. C.) a result
of Luca, "nam et stipendium Caesari decretum est *et decem* legati".
Such a result too was the *de Prov. cons.* of Cicero. i. e. that deal-
ing with Gaul but not that dealing with Macedon and Syria.

graph of a recent Italian scholar. The employment of Appian
2, 17 to furnish data for the theme of *Cesare, il gran cor-
ruttore* (Fer. 2, 48 and 67) one may let pass, (i. e. that Caesar
financed the election of his creatures and supporters,) except
in one point. That chapter in Appian is one of utter confusion
in data and detail. He and Plutarch evidently have transcribed
much if not all from one and the same source (Plut. Caes. 21) :
I am not inclined to name Pollio with Kornemann : Livy is vastly
more likely because the trend of the presentation is anti-
Caesarian. Appian transcribed with such haste as not to
realize that he was dealing with Luca and related subjects,
such haste indeed that he does not even name Luca, whereas
Plutarch presents all this with much clearness and with slightly
greater moderation : the point made in Plutarch's relation is
that (many) candidates at R., as I said, got their electoral
funds from Caesar, and when in office, requited him. How
Ferrero can transcribe such things and still with a straight
face insist that Caesar was a pretty loyal republican and did
not strive for ultimate autocratic power, I fail to see. That
" Roman Pericles " of Ferrero's is one of the many sophomoric
things which dazzle the ignorant but cause the well informed
to smile. Another pretty phrase which F. turned in his lathe
is to call Caesar (II 165, 190) "questo poeta geniale della
guerra e della politica ", it would do credit to a high school
miss speaking her piece in leafy June.

The sketch of public sentiment in Rome as it was immedi-
ately after the killing of Clodius[1] Jan. 52 (F. II 157) is
typical. The things which Ferrero writes *are psychologically
possible*, but he does there what a dramatist or a novelist may
write, but he has no warrant to call such things historiography.
Often does one think of Aristotle's οἷα ἂν γένοιτο, in the body
of his dramaturgy.

The exasperation at Rome against Caesar for the long dur-
ation of the Northwestern wars is positively self constructed
or autoschediastic on F.'s part. *If* there *had* been a press in
Rome, and *if* we *had* the files of those journals—if—if—if.

It is tiresome to read of Ferrero's valuation of Caesar's Gallic
Wars—even Besnier in the Revue Historique 1907 smiles at
the rhetoric of F., as being somewhat ad captandam Franco-

[1] We really have nothing valuable but Asconius

gallorum benevolentiam—: " la guerre de Gaule a régénéré
le monde antique"! a trumpet blast that would bring down
the walls of Jericho indeed.

The *fait accompli* sits in judgement here too, and the very
impressive historical fact that during all the titanic struggle
of the two dynasts there was not, as far as we know, any
serious enterprise or effort to cause a rising of the Kelts,
either regional or national.—What the aristocracy hoped,
(and, we may assume, hoped with great liveliness in 52, 51,
50 B. C.) was, that Caesar would perish, or would at least suf-
fer some very serious reverses there. We may cite Caelius'
report to Cicero (in May 51), Fam. 8, 1, 4. Quod ad Caesarem,
crebri et non belli de eo *rumores*, sed *susurratores* dumtaxat,
veniunt: alius, equitem perdidisse, quod opinor certe factum
est ; alius, septimam legionem vapulasse, ipsum apud Bellovacos
circumsederi interclusum ab reliquo exercitu; *neque adhuc
certi quidquam est,* NEQUE HAEC INCERTA TAMEN VULGO
IACTANTUR : vague news which the Caesarophobe Domitius
whispers into the ears of his friends. Such hard facts chime
but ill with Ferrero's modernizing constructions.—Caelius in
autumn 51 was not at all an enemy of Caesar's : if F. had taken
pains to have read all of Caelius' letters in Fam. 8, and made a
few simple notes he would not have committed blunders like this
one. (F. II 240). How does F. know that Cassius in 51 was
suspected of Caesarism? (II 244). Figure after figure the
new historian takes up and tries so very hard to give them a new
countenance, or a new dress or at least some ribbon or piece
of tinsel, like a young girl coming into the possession of her
older sister's dolls. So Curio—of all men—is now, at once to be
really respected as an *independent* politician or statesman (II
260–61). If ever there was a clever man ready for the highest
bidder, *he* was that man, even if we choose to disregard Vel-
leius' phrase of the 'ingeniosissime nequam'. How does
Ferrero know that Curio went beyond Caesar's orders? He
forgets about Balbus.

We are—*si dis placet*—actually to believe that Caesar, in
the autumn of 50, B. C., hoped for peace. The burden of all
our texts, records, documents is to go for nothing. But shall
we set them aside and accept Ferrero's unsupported affirm-
ations? Or has he had psychiatric revelations of his own?
Or did Caesar appear to him in his dreams?

Signor Ferrero then tells us, that Caesar, in December 50 was utterly *surprised* at the possibility of a storm, which since the homicide near Bovillae, in Jan. 52, and since the subsequent coalition of Pompey and the aristocracy, had come to be one of the most definitely sure things within the entire range of coming events.

The correspondence of Cicero, ever since he left his province (Summer 50 B. C.) to turn his face homeward once more, shows us both in every line as well as between the lines how *certain* the approach of crisis and catastrophe was felt to be by every one.—The great question of Cicero, question chronic, persistent and deeply troublous, was this and this alone: Where shall I stand? With whom of the two shall I range myself? Is a neutral position at all possible? On Dec 10 Cicero (having landed in Brundisium on Nov. 25) conceived *this* alternative of future contingencies: 1. *concordia*, i. e. the repairing or closing of the breach now patent and palpable to the world. 2. *Sin boni vincuntur*, i. e. the defeat of Pompey and the conservatives (Att. 7, 3, 2), whereas Caesar's defeat is *not* conceived as a probable contingency, is not brought into these reflexions at all.

The situation is definite: de sua potentia dimicant homines, (i. e. the two dynasts) hoc tempore (*dimico* goes well with the idea of a *duel*), periculo civitatis (§ 4). Caesar appears to Cicero on Dec. 10 as "homo audacissimus paratissimusque", i. e. relatively, comparing his situation with that of Pompey. The prevailing note which echoes and reechoes in Cicero's soul is: Too late! The time is close at hand when a man must call himself either a Caesarian or a Pompeian. If I do come out against Caesar, his Spaniard, Balbus, will perhaps dun me (Att. 7, 3, 11). *Sero* enim resistimus ei, quem per annos decem aluimus contra nos (Att. 7, 5, 5). Is Caesar to be a second Cinna or Sulla? (Att. 7, 7, 7).—But the most luminous of these monitory or forecasting utterances is this one, written late in December (Att. 7, 9, 2). "Aut, addita causa, si forte tribunus pl. senatum impediens aut populum incitans (Antony did both) *notatus* aut senatus consulto circumscriptus (Antony shortly afterwards had this very experience) *aut sublatus aut expulsus sit, dicensve se expulsum ad illum confugerit?*" I marvel that some Higher Critic does not assert

that this *must* be an ex post facto interpolation by some enemy
of Caesar? If I live long enough, I firmly expect such a
contribution to advanced scholarship to be made. But, really,
is it not a very curious and detailed computation of a contin-
gency so soon to become a historical reality pregnant with a
portentous series of consequences? The Arpinate in a way was
the chorus in that tragedy. Reviewing, then, the last nine
years the orator clearly discerns the path of *one* mighty will,
of *one* consistent and undeviating policy, he himself deriving
little consolation from such pondering and rumination.

At this point it may be well to turn back a little and fol-
low Cicero's own path and incidentally note some of Ferrero's
peculiar or exclusive affirmations in that part of his *Grandezza*.

Sometimes one is tempted—when reading the lively recital
of Cicero's Cilician proconsulate, to believe that for once Sig-
nor F. had settled down to a sober and painstaking study—
genuine *study*—of the indispensable and exclusive texts, all of
them, and every part of them. But at once we come upon a
blunder of hurry or ignorance so grotesque that we doubt it
all. Tullius Tiro: who, even superficially acquainted with
Cicero but knows of him, and of his services and intimate
literary relations and confidences—beyond all Boswells of
later times; whose biography of Cicero has furnished the
most precious things in Plutarch's Cicero and to whose early
planning and consistent industry we owe our collections of
Cicero's correspondence? Listen, dear reader, to the profound
information of Signor Ferrero, which I quote in the original
that no one may impute any unfairness to my own pen: "i
segretari, tra i quali uno liberto che portava il suo stesso nome
M. Tullio, *e uno giovane schiavo Tirone.* Poor Tiro! is such
the reward of thy devotion that thou shouldest be rent in-
twain and reduced to a mere half of thy being after so many
centuries!—To speak with moderation: When F. wrote his
Grandezza he evidently read ad Atticum and ad Fam. for the
first time, and then only piecemeal, and with superficial haste.
Or is it not so? His reading evidently merely *ad hoc* and
limping badly in the rear of his nimble pencilling. No wonder
then, too that he refers to Ariobarzanes at that time rul-
ing over Cappadocia (II 271) as *il vecchio re* di Cappa-
docia. Not acquainted with the text of the Cilician corre-

spondence in detail he confounded the youth (placed under Cicero's *tutela* by special action of the senate) with the latter's father.   Att. 5, 18, 4 (iam exhibeo *pupillum*, neque defendo) cf. also Tyrrell's editing of the text of Fam. 15, 2, 5.: *et tamen adolescentem esse* and § 6.—The reference in Ferrero's footnote, p. 278 (the defence of Cicero against the criticism "del Tyrrell *e del* Purser") shows clearly that Ferrero must be virtually ignorant of T. and P., for he classes them with Drumann (!!) as unfair judges of Cicero's proconsulate! Indeed a *little* knowledge ' del Tyrrell e del Purser ' is a dangerous thing.   The world knows well that nowhere in modern classicism is there any fairer or better-balanced estimate of Cicero as well as of all the main persons occurring in his correspondence, than in Dr. Tyrrell's monumental work.—Terentia if we may trust the *only* authority we have, had *nothing* to do with the arrangement of poor Tullia's third and last matrimonial venture (F. II 280).   In II 281 we read : "un certo Cresto, un giornalista di professione."   In Cic. Fam. 2, 8, 1 Cicero quotes *ordinary news* from Rome with which he did not wish to be bothered, such as the pairing of gladiators, adjournments of trials, and "Chresti compilatio" which Tyrrell calls a 'robbery by Chrestus' an ordinary burglary.   Why indeed if it meant "*compilation*"[1]—how could a 'compilation' by a nobody be a piece of news for a Cicero?   Compilation of what?   And even if *compilatio* here should be taken in the modern (literary) sense, what warrant has the author of the *Grandezza* to call the poor devil Chrestus "a professional journalist"?   Cheap and onesided to hit off a Cicero by such current commonplace as "uomo della penna" or "il vecchio scrittore".   For if Ferrero had studied *all* the works and all the sequence of Cicero's life, he would know that to the Arpinate, when he felt himself master of himself, and in a *free* government (really free), literature was only a *second choice*, and his practice before the praetor urbanus was excelled probably *if* excelled by only *one* contemporary at the Roman bar, Servius Sulpicius, about whom Mr. F. must consult Pomponius in the introduction to the Digest of Roman Law.

Let us pause here to write down a few words of proper appreciation of Cicero's *de Republica* which F. glibly presents

[1] The Thesaurus probably caught napping here.

as the exposition of the political sentiments of *le alte classi*. The work as we know from a line of Caelius (Fam. 8, 1, 4) was published about the time in May 51 when Cicero in leisurely stages travelled towards Brundisium to embark for his proconsulate. " Tui politici libri omnibus vigent ".—which means this: your books (on Political Science,) your treatise on the State is considered a strong production by everyone (i. e. who reads them).—How does Ferrero interpret the words of Caelius?: " questa ammirazione mondiale " (II 266), an absurd exaggeration. What made the work notable when Atticus put it out? It was absolutely the first book in finished Latin on such a theme, but we have not the slightest data in the extant fragments of the work for assuming that Cicero designed or projected any practical influence in affecting or directing political thought in his time. He *sums up* (as he had *summed up* in the preceding general work *de Oratore*): he draws a line under his life's total sum. He gives expression not at all to class-convictions *per se*: he is no mere pen or penciller of social prejudices or notions. To one, who has striven for several decades to gain a real familiarity with this unique and manysided man, a man so much half-understood and still more quarter-understood or held in fancied familiarity on account of a little spelling out of a few minor things, a man known by a few glimpses or juvenile incursions—to such a one I say who sifts all his works and the entire sequence of his career, there is a *very high degree* of *consistency* in Cicero's political theory and his concrete political judgements. This then is what I have elsewhere called a philosophical, an ethical conservatism. When he was composing this treatise he knew absolutely nothing of the possible contingency of a proconsulate for himself. Still by this book (as well as by Xenophon's Cyropaedia) was he willing to have his administration of Cilicia judged. One of the fundamental points (suggested also in the ultra-elaborate allegory in which the introduction is couched) was this, that he considered the double initiative in the Roman system of legislation an evil, and the Tribunate in this connection a factor in public life which made genuine *unity* of the commonwealth simply impossible.[1]—Aristocratic initiative and control however he conceives by no means in the narrow

---

[1] Ludwig Lange holds the same view.

partisan sense of the Optimates of the day: e. g. " which always must be maintained in this state, viz. *that the most numerous class shall not count the most* (ne plurimum valeant plurimi II 39)—by which he means a firm control of the plebeian masses.

But concrete Roman history (II 54) much better than Plato's speculation, teaches us actual statesmanship and the best political lessons. Consciousness of *le alte classi*? Why, Cicero utterly condemns the social present as the *fait accompli* of a wretched decadence [and the *alte classi* certainly were the chief performers in this process]: *to his contemporaries that Rome which he knows and loves, is not even known any more,* they have virtually ceased to read their Ennius. . . .

But Rome even now decadent and decaying as it is, is still founded on the moral vigour and the stern fibre of the olden time. *That* alone is the explanation of Roman greatness— qualities which remind the author of a fine painting which has become blurred through age. " Our time (V 2) has neglected to renew the colours, but has not even conserved the painting itself, its form and as it were its drawing. *For what remains of ancient morality through which he* (Ennius) *said that the Roman state stood? A morality which we see so buried in oblivion that it is not even known* ". For what shall I say of the men? Our time is a period of decadence. " Mores enim ipsi interierunt virorum penuria ".—It is all an Elegy of the *Nevermore.*—Ferrero reveals not even a trace of genuine insight into the structure or essence of this treatise.—His incursions or raids into the domain of Roman literature are in the main woeful performances, superficial, sophomoric and glittering with the gold leaf of literary commonplace. After Bernhardy, Teuffel, Mommsen, Schanz, Ribbeck, Leo, Madvig, Robinson Ellis, Nettleship, Munro, Sir John Sandys, Tyrrell— to read his paragraphs is simply like biting on a small stone, whether he deals with Lucretius or Catullus or Cicero or Varro or any one else in this domain, or when he glibly writes of " la vecchia epica monumentale di Ennio *e Pacuvio* ": so Pacuvius wrote epic too.

" Denn wo Begriffe fehlen, stellt schnell das Wort sich ein ". The way in which Ferrero works up Att. 9, 18, the report by Cicero of his conference with Caesar at his Formianum, in

March 49 may be called semi-novelistic or semi-journalistic or what you like, but it is not warranted by the text, is not derivable from the spirit or the words of that communication.

What were Cicero's motives in May-June (49) for joining Pompey in Epirus? Listen to the novel sociological explanation (II 379): "per un supremo ravvivamento della sua devozione *di borghese timido verso questo gran signor*". Indeed? Cicero who said "Cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi", a *borghese timido* towards any living being in his own generation?

Borghese timido may sound pretty in a Parisian *salon*, but it is stark nonsense. We have here a wealth of data. Cicero since 63 rated himself not lower than any man in public life; not lower than Pompey. His exile added enormously to what we may call his political self-esteem, for he considered himself a martyr for the cause of order, law, property, decency, morals. As he rated the Luculli Hortensii, etc. lower, he certainly rated himself higher. He was in a word much prouder than the average aristocrat, for he owed everything to himself. The S. C. which designated him *Pater Patriae* after the Nones of December 63 was no common or mean thing. No part of his own self-communion exhibits a harder or more beaten path than the favorite mood in which he compares himself with the aristocracy whom at almost all points he had so palpably outshone from the beginning. And even that distinction, gained with legions and eagles in the ever widening periphery of the empire, he did not hesitate to challenge.

And so, early in 62, soon after the expiration of his consular year, when the impending return of Pompey from the East was looming ever larger in the public eye, he wrote (pro Sulla 26): sibi haberent honores, sibi imperia, sibi triumphos, sibi alia praeclarae laudis insignia" etc. While even then Theophanes of Mytilene had begun to make Pompey's achievements the theme of his pen, we know with what feverish persistence [1] Cicero made or strove to have made lasting literary record of his consular achievements. We take note of the fact that Cicero composed his περὶ ὑπατείας in what was *then* the language of world-fame, Greek, *before* he wrote his Latin memoir: that he wrote the Latin Epic himself, but failed in his efforts

[1] Cf. Plut. Cic. 22.

to stir Archias or old Posidonius in Rhodes to propagate his renown in finished Greek. *Timido borghese?* It was in 62 too that Cicero sent to Pompey in the East a memoir on the same subject, the all-engrossing subject of how he had curbed and at last destroyed a domestic revolution. In form this was a "letter". But what a letter. The scroll was bulkier than many libri. " Nam significat epistulam non mediocrem *ad instar voluminis* scriptam, quam Pompeio in Asiam *De Rebus suis in consulatu gestis* miserat Cicero, *aliquanto* ut videbatur, *insolenter scriptam* (presumptuous, rather) ut Pompei stomachum non mediocriter commoveret: quod *quadam superbiore iactantia omnibus se gloriosis ducibus anteponeret.* (Schol. Bob. 270–71 Or.)

Pompey's rejoinder seems to have been slight or slighting. We possess Cicero's second epistle, brief, but very proud indeed. If, in striking the balance between us *my* services are the greater—so much the better for my self-respect ! " Nulla enim re tam laetari soleo quam meorum officiorum conscientia, quibus si quando non mutue respondetur, apud me plus officii residere facile patior " (Fam. 5, 7, 2).

A great orator in public life has a certain affinity with a great actor, but he is something more, for he must have some elements of real greatness both in character and ideals. In the clash of titanic forces when the Caeliuses, Sallusts, Curios, Dolabellas were swayed by material considerations mainly, and were like donkeys turning towards the bigger bundles of hay, Cicero even then kept true to his finer convictions, he was indeed *sui generis*, he was what the Germans call " *ein innerlicher Mensch*", swayed largely by finer and nobler sentiments—προσπέπονθα τῷ καλῷ he once wrote to his friend [1]—'too much so for my material advantage '. To be called *ungrateful* was something he could not endure even to conceive in his mind.

His *political* judgement in the spring of 49 condemned Pompey. He was however, as I have said elsewhere, not only one of the most *grateful* men of history, but also firm in his gratitude and prepared for very positive sacrifices and even calamities in such resolutions. It was this which made him cross the Adriatic to Durazzo. His soul readily and power-

[1] Att. 2, 19, 1.

fully echoed with lines, which became a force within him, because his general character gave them lodgement and decisive influence, and these things happened not in the quiet musings of a library but in a mighty tempest, when the consideration of to be or not to be ever dwelled before the souls of men. It was then that certain lines of Homer burned themselves into his soul (Att. 9, 5, 3) : " Ego igitur, siquidem apud Homerum, cui et mater et dea dixisset

αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ᾽ Ἕκτορα πότμος ἑτοῖμος,

matri ipse (scil. Achilles) respondet

αὐτίκα τεθναίην, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ᾽ ἔμελλον ἑταίρῳ
κτεινομένῳ ἐπαμῦναι . . .

It will be my ruin, but I must go. A soul such as Cicero's was is not filled with any class-consciousness but it is the possession of, it marks a very specific, a unique personality. And so too, when all this was over he spoke (or published) in the autumn of 46 (pro Marcello 14), a perfect confirmation of the sentiments and the pencillings of the spring of 49: Hominem sum secutus privato officio, non publico, tantumque apud me *grati animi fidelis memoria* valuit, ut nulla non modo cupiditate, sed ne spe quidem, prudens et sciens tamquam ad interitum ruerem voluntarium.—' Timido borghese ' !

As to Cicero's difference with Terentia and his motives for a divorce we *have* data, which F. could have found in the letters of Cicero, or at least in Drumann. Or if he will take Orelli's *Onomasticon* s. v. " *Philotimus*, libertus, ut videtur, Terentiae potius quam Ciceronis " and verify all the references there given he will probably solve the problem. Like other writers who spread a knowledge (which cannot be critical in many details) over a very large surface, Saintsbury for instance, Ferrero hastily classifies or designates the philosophical books of Cicero's last years as swayed largely by the type of the Platonic dialogue.—" Riassumere la filosofia Greca in un seguito di dialoghi simili a quelli di Platone "—: as every classical scholar knows—not at all, in their *form*, nor in any other way, either. The positive dramatic art of Plato Cicero knew well was beyond him. It was Aristotle's form of dialogue, which Cicero in the main followed, and all this although he derived from Plato's State (deus ille noster Plato

Att. 4, 16, 3) certain material incentives: though, what free-
dom of original construction if we compare the *Somnium
Scipionis* with the vision of Er the Armenian!—

Cicero does not develop any system of his own. Some *one*
speaker or lecturer we would say presents the doctrine of *one*
school on the main topic of the treatise. These relations are
really didactic presentations of systems extant and consum-
mated, while the Academy of Carneades furnishes the *aqua
fortis* of keen analysis and freer valuation of Stoa and Garden.
For these two really were the great systems of the day.
Cicero was a practical eclectic, not the devotee of ˙any one
school, although he owed his dialectic largely to Philo and
Antiochos, and his deeper ethical conceptions to the Stoa in
the main. It is clear that any genuine repristination of the
Platonic art even as a literary form, at this stage of ancient
civilization had become quite impossible, even if a Latin Plato
had arisen. It may be well to cite here what Cicero wrote to
Atticus in June 45 (Att. 13, 19, 4) : Quae autem his temporibus
scripsi, 'Αριστοτέλειον morem habent, in quo sermo ita inducitur
ceterorum, ut penes ipsum sit principatus etc.) in short a didac-
tic rather than a dramatic presentation. Special students of
Aristotle[1] use this very passage to reconstruct some clearer
notion of that thinker's Dialogues.

But to return to Caesar. The flank movement of Pompey's
cavalry at Pharsalos was *not* directed mainly at Caesar's
cavalry—a negligible force on that day—but at his right wing
and indeed at his entire position (Caes. b. c. 3, 93). The
date, Aug. 9 of the Roman calendar, was about June 6, 48 by
the solar year, not *end* of June.—The boyish age of the last
Ptolemy (p. 423) seems to have escaped Ferrero.—As for
Pompey, he was by no means a typical aristocrat at all, the
ambition of his life, from Sulla's return onward was to stand
apart from, to be revered as one standing *above* the parties.
No less than Caesar, Pompey was *sui generis* through and
through.

Diochares is called by Ferrero "uno dei piu celeri *schiavi
di Cesare*", but Att. 11, 6, 7: "quaere ex Diochare, Caesaris
liberto".—When the news of Pompey's death reached Rome,
whence did F. derive this? "Scoppiò in tutti i ceti un furore

---

[1] As e. g. Heitz. Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles.

di entusiasmo per lui". The question is not as to what was
psychologically possible, but *what we know about it*. How
does F. tell of the manner in which Cleopatra captured Cae-
sar? By reciting the entire gamut of psychological or physio-
logical *possibilities* (2, 430). He never mentions Lucan who
was so much nearer Livy than Dio.—As for Servius Sulpi-
cius, one must not class him as a Caesarian at all.—Is there
anywhere, even in Cicero's writings, a nobler elegy on the pass-
ing of the Republic than that exquisite letter of consolation
sent by the jurist in Achaia to the bereaved Cicero? (Fam. 4,
5). " Cogita quemadmodum adhuc fortuna nobiscum egerit:
ea nobis erepta esse, quae hominibus non minus quam liberi
cara esse debent, patriam, honestatem, dignitatem, honores
omnes" (ib. § 2). Sulpicius simply accepted the iron logic
of results, but his affection for the old order was not a whit
less deep and sincere, than that of Cicero.—When F. says of
the schoolboy king of Egypt: " Tolomeo era morto *durante la
guerra*", one receives the impression that the exact date of
his death was unknown: but he perished in the Nile with his
golden corselet on, on Mch. 27 (Fasti Praenestini).

The influence of the Alexandrian life and incidental pleasures
on Caesar are mere psychological speculations (2,444), we
really know nothing about them. The campaign of Thapsus is
done in a great hurry and it is not likely that F. has devoted
any serious study to that admirable report, the *Bellum Af-
ricum*. Ferrero's knowledge of even the barest outline is so
poor that he actually has Cato *flee to Utica after the battle,*
whereas the Stoic was in command there during the entire
campaign. These things (and *many* others for the enumera-
tion of which there is no space) show, with what hurried and
superficial procedure Ferrero, in the main, compiled his first
two volumes. His great ambition (viz. to be as un-Mommsen-
ian or anti-Mommsenian as possible) tempts him constantly
into constructions which are untenable, fanciful, or absurd.—
With Mommsen Caesar is the " Monarch" as soon as he
crossed the Rubicon, while F. (2, 455) informs us: " sebbene
avesse incominciato la guerra non per ambizione del supremo
potere" etc. add pp. 456, 458.—Of Caesar's 'discourse' in the
Senate (after returning from the Thapsus campaign via Sar-
dinia) we are not so sure. We have only the written speech

of Dio (43, 15–18), the consistent imitator of Thucydides. It is quite risky to treat this speech, (this Dionian ratiocinative presentation of that situation) as history, as F. does. We lack support of Dio.—Why were the '*elogi* di Catone'—'*stupidi*'? (475).

As to Cleopatra in Rome and as to her departure from the park of Caesar a few matters should be made clear.—Here again we see, that F. has merely *browsed* in Cicero's correspondence (F. 2, 476), but has not taken pains to make an exhaustive study of the same. We know, then, that Cleopatra was still in the capital during the Ides and even some time later. F. got *his* version from Suet. Caes. 52 in part. But Cicero wrote at Sinuessa, on April 15, 44 B. C., a full month after the Ides (Att. 14, 8, 1): "Reginae fuga (i. e. hurried departure from Rome) mihi non molesta est".—On May 11 he plainly intimates his hope that Cleopatra may have had a miscarriage (Att. 14, 20, 2): "Tertullae nollem abortum (wife of Cassius), tam enim Cassii sunt quam Bruti serendi. *De regina velim* atque etiam de Caesare illo. Cf. Tyrrell's note.— About Caesar's Anticato F. says: "per confutare l'ideologia repubblicana che pareva (where?) rifiorire". . . . The traces of Caesar's monograph in Plutarch's Cato min. (11, 36, 52, 54) and elsewhere (Plin. Ep. 3, 12) and the activities of Hirtius are not unknown to us (Att. 12, 40, 1). "Qualis futura sit *Caesaris vituperatio* contra *laudationem meam* perspexi ex eo libro, quem Hirtius ad me misit, in quo *vitia Catonis colligit*". The pretty phrase of F. above is pure fancy. But we have no space to puncture all the iridescent soap-bubbles of Signor Ferrero.

The Bellum Hispaniense with its precious report of Caesar's address at Corduba seems to be unknown to the Italian writer.—"This address is presented with a vigour and with forceful antitheses of the rhetorical art, which were simply beyond the poor literary powers of this writer. The angry pride of Caesar breathes from every sentence with the living pulse-beat of truth and psychological concinnity".[1]

The project of changing the course of the Tiber is mentioned by Cicero *before* Caesar's return from the Munda-campaign. (Att. 13, 33, 4)—There was no indignation at Rome

---

[1] Annals of Caes. 288.

at the prospect *per se* of a Parthian campaign. Ferrero's inferences from Att. 13, 31, 3 are hasty.—In drawing on Suet. 77 about Caesar's last period, F. overlooks the important words; "ut T. Ampius (one of the bitterest anti-Caesarian writers of the times) scribit". Caesar's sober dinner as Cicero's guest down at the Puteolanum (Dec. 45) with their discussions of literary topics (Att. 13, 52) is designated by F. as "orgia"!—While thus utterly perverting the traceable and definite things, F., like a psychiatric expert, presents the invisible factors in Caesar's soul.—How does F. know, (App. 2, 107) that Caesar's Spanish guards were *slaves?* (2,499).

Among the more ambitious paradoxes of Ferrero is his new estimate of Brutus. We know *Caesar's* estimate of that peculiar character: his "quicquid hic volt, valde volt", his manner of argumentation so impressed that eminent judge of character, Caesar (Att. 14, 1, 2). Brutus later divorced a Claudia and married the daughter of the man whom of *all* men of his generation Caesar seems to have abominated most. Also Brutus glorified the Stoic in every way and devoted himself very largely to what we would call the source-study of the Old Republic. We had been considering him really a character of extraordinary persistence. No longer! We now learn from the new historian that Brutus was *debole,* a weak character (p. 507). And, once having made his diagnosis he abides by it.—Antony and Lepidus, in the session of March 17, in the temple of Tellus did *not* have a majority. Was there any amnesty at Athens "from time to time"? Cicero certainly means that connected with the democratic restoration by Thrasybulus. Who knows of any other?

· Another entirely novel thing: (III, p. 37) Antony's funeral oration consisted merely of a few sentences (App. 2, 145 sqq.). We may perhaps set aside the biographical discourse in Dio (44, 36–49) as a Thucydidean composition. F. seems to follow Suetonius 84: "*Laudationis loco* consul Antonius per praeconem pronuntiavit senatus consulta, quibus omnia simul ei divina atque humana decreverat, item ius iurandum . . . . . quibus *perpauca a se verba addidit*". Still Cicero calls it a *contio*, and we see that it was spread broadcast all over Italy within a few weeks (Att. 14, 11, 1). Therefor Ferrero's pronouncement: "il discorso incendiario di Antonio è una

leggenda " (III, p. 37) is not quite certain.   Atticus rated that
discourse as a *decisive* political act in destroying the public
security of the regicides.   But what did Atticus know about
it?   And what becomes of Lange's other references, Plut.
Anton. 14, Brut. 20; Att. 14, 14, 3, and particularly Cic. 2 Phil.
2, 91 : tua *illa* pulchra *laudatio* (famous within a very short
time) tua *miseratio,* tua *cohortatio* : there must have been a
very substantial *plus* beyond what Suetonius relates.   But
what did Cicero know about it?

If nothing durable was founded by Caesar, as Ferrero af-
firms, why then the immediate succession and the struggles of
the pretenders?   Hirtius (III 69) "became a Caesarian once
more ".   He had never been anything else.   His very books
to supplement Caesar were written after the Ides and before
January 1, 43 B. C.

The Ituraean archers of Antony are called purchased slaves
by Ferrero (3, 80).   What is his authority?   There is no
sober reason for censuring Cicero for his desire to go to
Greece in the summer of 44 B. C.   Absurd to call the man
timido who delivered the First Philippic and the others in that
swan's song of the Roman Republic.

What Antony feared in the summer and autumn of 44 was
not the Conservatives, but Caesar's heir.—The time of Dola-
bella's departure for the East *is* known.—Roman history, not
Aristotle, was the real basis of Cicero's political theory (F.
3, 133).

The real point of time when Octavian, in 43 B. C. seems to
have determined to throw Cicero over was probably soon after
he heard of Cicero's epigram, in May.   The letter of Decimus
Brutus telling of it is dated at Eporedia (Ivrea) at the foot
of the Alps, May 25 (Fam. 11, 20, 1), "narrat mihi apud
Caesarem se fuisse multumque sermonem de te habitum esse;
ipsum Caesarem (Octavian) nihil sane de te questum nisi
dictum (one of Cicero's bon-mots) quod diceret te dixisse:
" laudandum adolescentem, ornandum, tollendum ". . . . . as
Suetonius (Aug. 12) relates it: "ad praetextum mutatae
voluntatis ".—As to the last summer of Cicero's life, few
things are as illuminating as the letters of Pollio from South-
ern Spain written to the man who still then was his literary
ideal.   And yet, with that characteristic bluntness of his

(Fam. 10, 31–33) he avowed to Cicero his friendship for Antony and for Plancus. He went so far in the first of those letters, which otherwise was cordial, as to censure Antony for having abandoned the siege of Mutina. We see that Caesar's real friends desired no truce or composition with the regicides.—The strong anti-Ciceronian strain in Appian from the Ides of March to Cicero's death seems to be due however to the Historiae of the very same Asinius, written after Actium 31 B. C. The data are fairly familiar and are placed in correlation by Kornemann.[1] Soon after the establishment of the Second Triumvirate Pollio, under the pressure of circumstances, abandoned what friendly feelings for Cicero he may have secretly cultivated up to a point of time not long before. So far indeed was he carried away by the interests of the new dynasts and by his adjustment to their interests, that in a speech pro Lamia (not very long after Cicero's foul death) he even referred to Cicero's character with contempt (Sen. Suas. 6, 14). The severest charge however is contained in these words: (ib. § 15) "Huic certe actioni pro Lamia (one of the proscribed of 43 B. C.) qui interfuerunt *negant* eum haec dixisse—nec enim mentiri sub triumvirorum conscientia sustinebat—*sed postea composuisse*". But he did not dare to put it into his *historiae*, some twelve years later. Ferrero's "La vera importanza storica di Cicerone" (F. 3, 255) are fervid paragraphs meant to be impressive, but largely negligible by serious students. Too often has Ferrero betrayed ignorance or at best hurried acquaintance with the very extensive writings of the Arpinate; p. 254 sounds like a little sediment from Zielinski, but it is quite immaterial whether it is or not. The shallow absurdity of the former journalist however will out: "la importanza storica di Cicerone non solo eguaglia quella di Cesare, ma è di poco inferiore a quella *di Gesù*, di Paolo, di Agostino". How can any sober student of human history take such declamation seriously!

E. G. SIHLER.

UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, NEW YORK.

[1] Die historische Schriftstellerei des Asinius Pollio 1896.

III.—THE HINDU BEAST FABLE IN THE LIGHT
OF RECENT STUDIES.

It is now fifty-five years since the publication of Theodor
Benfey's two-volume work on the Pañcatantra.[1] This great
pioneer work, besides giving a scholarly translation of the
only Sanskrit text of the Pañcatantra then published, set for
itself two difficult and important tasks.[2] In the first place, it
endeavored for the first time to give a history of the famous
collection of Indian fables commonly called the Pañcatantra,
in all of its numerous ramifications and offshoots, both inside
and outside of India. Secondly, it attempted—likewise for
the first time—to trace the history of the individual story and
fable themes found in the different versions of the ' Pañca-
tantra '.

At that time these studies were in their infancy. The mate-
rials at Benfey's command were so meager, compared with
what we possess today, that the degree of success which he
attained can only command our most profound admiration,
amounting almost to reverence. Benfey was one of the giants.

But far more important than the specific results which he
attained was the interest he aroused in these subjects among a
large group of enthusiastic younger scholars. He gave an
impetus to the study not only of the ' Pañcatantra ' literature,
but also of comparative folklore in general; an impetus which
is still felt to this day, and which gives Benfey a fair right to
be called the founder of this branch of research. Though
some of his views are no longer tenable in the light of our
present knowledge, we must remember that at least a very
considerable part of that knowledge has come directly or in-
directly out of the labors of his own school. And practically

[1] Pañcatantra: Fünf Bücher indischer Fabeln, Märchen und Erzähl-
ungen. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt, mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen.
(2 vols.) Erster Theil: Einleitung. Zweiter Theil: Uebersetzung und
Anmerkungen. Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1859.
[2] Cf. op. cit., I. p. 1.

all of it may be said to have resulted from labors which owed their primary impulse directly or indirectly to the inspiration of his studies.

Since Benfey's day an enormous amount of work has been done in these lines. The study of comparative folklore—that is, the comparison of different versions or outgrowths of the same story themes—has assumed encyclopedic proportions. It would now be quite impossible to treat scientifically in a single work—unless it were indeed an encyclopedia—all the relationships of the story-themes found in the different Pañcatantra versions, as Benfey tried to do. But even in the narrower field of these Pañcatantra versions themselves and their inter-relationship, so much has been done that we now stand on a totally different footing from that of Benfey's time. Many versions of the Pañcatantra, both Indian and extra-Indian, which Benfey only knew in manuscript or did not know at all, have been edited and published. Some versions of prime importance have been discovered since that time. These include two which are probably the oldest and best representatives of the original Pañcatantra now known; namely, the Old Syriac version of Kalila and Dimna, and the Sanskrit Tantrākhyāyika.[1]

These and many other important discoveries have thrown a flood of new light on the subject, and have made imperatively necessary a revision of the work of Benfey, so far as it deals with the relationship of the different versions; or rather, they have made necessary a new work on this subject. Such a new work now lies before us in Hertel's Pañcatantra.[2] This book will certainly be for many years to come one which every student of fable-literature—Indian, Semitic, or European—will have to keep on his work-table. Furthermore, all who are interested in comparative literature will find in it the only up-to-date account of the wanderings of the Hindu beast-fable, which is one of the most romantic chapters of general comparative literature.

' Das Pañcatantra ' is a complete history of the Pañcatantra

---

[1] See below, pp. 52 ff. and 66 f.

[2] Das Pañcatantra: seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung. Von Johannes Hertel. Gekrönte Preisschrift. Verlag von B. G. Teubner in Leipzig und Berlin, 1914.

and all its outgrowths, based on all the sources now known.[1] This includes, of course, a competent and valuable survey of the extra-Indian versions, which are almost all descendants of the Arabic Kalila and Dimna, a translation of a lost Pahlavi translation of a lost Sanskrit version, which was in existence in the sixth century A. D. Of this more anon.

But by far the greater part of the bulky volume is taken up with the history of the Pañcatantra in the land of its origin. It is in this field that the author is especially at home. Indeed, no one living can claim such an intimate acquaintance with the Sanskrit versions. In the course of the last twenty years Hertel has devoted himself to this subject with tireless energy. He has critically edited and published most of the important Sanskrit texts. He has himself discovered, edited and translated the most important of all—the Tantrākhyāyika. He has devoted numerous articles and monographs[2] to very painstaking and laborious researches dealing with the interrelation of these versions, examining carefully and minutely all the manuscripts he could lay his hands on (about one hundred in all); and he has gradually evolved a very definite theory as to the genealogy of the versions, of the correctness of which he is himself, at least, absolutely convinced.

In the present book, of course, it could not be expected that Hertel would repeat all of the intricate, detailed, and highly technical arguments on which he bases his theories as to the relation of the different versions. For the most part, he does little more than state his conclusions on points which he has discussed at length elsewhere. He treats *in extenso* only those Indian versions which he now deals with for the first time. Unfortunately for non-specialist users of the book, this means that he devotes long sections to many late, secondary, and largely non-Sanskritic versions (Gujerati, Marāthī, Braj

[1] Hertel wisely does not undertake to cover the other field treated by Benfey in his 'Einleitung'—the wanderings of the individual story themes. He restricts himself to versions of the Pañcatantra, or works based wholly or in large part upon such versions. It would have been madness to try to do more at present.

[2] A list of Hertel's publications on this subject up to 1909 is given in Sylvain Lévi's review of Hertel's Tantrākhyāyika, Journal Asiatique, 1909, p. 531 f. The list contains 31 books and monographs, published between 1895 and 1909.

Bhākhā, Tamil, etc.), which are of very scant general interest;
while the old Sanskrit versions are passed over in a few
words—with references, to be sure, to Hertel's previous treat-
ments of them.

This method was, I suppose, unavoidable; the work is
bulky enough as it is. It is nevertheless regrettable. For the
confident style of the author, combined with this marked lack
of argumentation on crucial points, gives the impression, to
those who are not intimately acquainted with the subject, that
the general problems of the relationship of the versions are
settled for good and all. Without meaning to reflect on the
value of Hertel's studies, I must cling to the opinion that some
of them are very far from settled.

I have referred to a certain apparent over-confidence which
is noticeable in the style of all Hertel's writings. He seems
to use words in a sense different from that which they ordi-
narily have. 'Ganz sicher' with him appears to mean 'prob-
able': 'ganz unzweifelhaft', 'not unlikely'. For 'undenkbar'
understand 'unlikely'; for 'ganz ausgeschlossen' understand
'scarcely probable'. Such expressions swarm in Hertel's
pages; and he does not always furnish so convenient a trans-
lation of them as he does on page LIV of his introduction to
the edition of the Southern Pañcatantra. Here, in the text,
he says: 'Wenn wir nun auch erst Zeugnisse etwa aus dem
Jahre 800 für die Çāradā-Schrift haben, so werden wir *sicher-
lich* annehmen dürfen, dass sie älter ist . . . " What he means
by the word *sicherlich* (italicized by me) is explained in his
footnote to the above sentence: "So urteilt auch Bühler, De-
tailed Report S. 31: 'I feel, therefore, *not certain* that the
Çāradā alphabet is *not* one of the ancient literary alphabets,
dating perhaps from the times of the Guptas or earlier'".
The equation is as clear as could be desired; Hertel's *sicher-
lich* = Bühler's *not certain that . . . not.* This passage is worth
quoting as an indication of the value of Hertel's superlatives.
I regret to say that it appears to be quite typical.

Disagreeable as it is to me to find any fault with one for
whose splendid achievements for our studies I have such
a profound admiration, I should have been recreant to my
duty had I omitted to warn non-specialists of this unfortunate,
and of course wholly unconscious, tendency to extreme state-

ments. It is only fair to add, however, that Hertel has proved himself a great enough scholar to withdraw from certain untenable positions which he had formerly taken with his usual positiveness, when it became clear that they were, indeed, untenable positions. It should also be emphasized that he himself has taken the greatest pains to furnish his critics with all possible means of testing his theories. I have a good deal of sympathy with Hertel's impatience toward certain of his critics, who have expressed general doubts without any attempt to defend them, or really to argue against Hertel. Conclusions based on twenty years of minute textual study, by a man who is admitted to be an extremely learned and acute scholar, cannot be cavalierly waved aside by anyone's 'impressions'. Hertel has a perfect right to demand that before publicly dissenting from his views, a scholar must take the trouble of following him as carefully as possible through his Pilgrim's Progress of the Pañcatantra versions.

Up to a certain point, I think it is true—and if true, it is surely significant—that those of Hertel's critics who seem to have gone most minutely into the comparison of the Pañcatantra versions, have also been the ones who have come nearest to agreeing with Hertel.

I have myself been at considerable pains to read, and have striven to digest, the somewhat formidable amount of Hertel literature which has been published within the last fifteen years. I have furthermore made an intensive and comparative study, on my own account, of some considerable sections of the Pañcatantra in all the important early versions, taking advantage of the valuable facilities for work of this sort which Hertel's various publications furnish. Specifically, I have tabulated the variant readings for all the verses occurring in the first book of the Pañcatantra (roughly speaking, one-third of the whole text), in all the older Sanskrit and Semitic versions; and I have treated in the same way the prose parts of a number of stories. Some interesting results have come out in the course of this work; I hope to present them at a future time. For the present I desire simply to mention these facts by way of showing that I have neither blindly accepted anything, nor rejected it on the basis of preconceived opinions or vague impressions.

What I propose to do in the remainder of this article is this. I shall state, in as brief a form as possible, for the convenience of non-Sanskritists, what seems to me to be the present best opinion among scholars as to the following questions. First, the date and character of the original Pañcatantra— the work from which all the versions must be supposed to have been derived. Secondly, the character of the older and more important of the individual versions, with especial reference to their relation to each other and to the original work, and their comparative closeness to that original work. Thirdly, and rather incidentally, I shall refer in connection with each version mentioned to its best available editions and translations. In a continuation of this article, to be published later, I shall undertake a more detailed and technical critique of certain important points of Hertel's 'genealogical table' of Pañcatantra versions.

It may in general be understood that in default of a statement to the contrary I am stating views which are not inconsistent with Hertel's position. With that position I am, on the whole, in accord. Some of his important theses I think he has proved pretty conclusively. Few of them seem to me capable of absolute disproof, in the present state of our knowledge. The only general fault I would find with Hertel is that to which I have already referred—his cocksureness, to use a bit of venerable English slang. Substituting *may* for *must* throughout his most recent book, I could reduce it to such a state that, with a few exceptions, I should almost be willing to subscribe to every section.

1. *The Original Work, or 'Urpañcatantra'.*

This is now lost to us; our knowledge of it is based solely on its descendants. It was probably composed about the third or fourth century A. D., in the Sanskrit language,[1] by an adherent of some orthodox Brahmanican cult (Hertel thinks, a Viṣṇuite; at any rate, he was not a Buddhist or a Jaina) whose name we do not know. The book consisted of an introduction and five sections, each section called a *tantra*. The meaning of this word is disputed; Hertel argues that it means 'trick'

[1] So Hertel, to my mind quite decisively. I see nothing in Sylvain Lévi's objections, JA. 1909, p. 534.

('Klugheitsfall'). There are certainly some arguments of
weight on that side, and I personally incline to it rather than
to the opinion of Winternitz,[2] who thinks it means simply
'section of a scientific work', 'section' in general. At any
rate, the main purpose of the book was to teach worldly wis-
dom—especially political wisdom, of a highly unmoral and
Machiavellian variety. It did this by both precept and example.
The precepts were put into the form of verses containing wise
saws and maxims. The examples, illustrating the lessons in-
culcated by the verses, were furnished by the fables them-
selves, which were in prose.

Hertel is doubtless right in emphasizing the general tone of
the original work as tricky and unmoral, if not positively im-
moral. None of the stories of the original reveal such marked
religious purposes as appear in many Buddhistic and Jainistic
stories. Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that he pushes
this point quite too far. He is inclined to insist very strictly
that every story of the original shall contain a 'tricky' lesson.
If it does not contain any such to his mind, out it goes: ver-
dict, 'unecht'. He attributes to the author more care and
consistency than I should wish to attribute to any Hindu, in
contending that having started out with a general purpose in
mind, he must necessarily have stuck closely to that purpose
throughout the work, looking neither to the right nor to the
left. I can hardly doubt that the author would not have hesi-
tated to put in now and then a rattling good story that he
knew of, even if it did not happen to teach a clear Machiavel-
lian lesson.

The author may have composed some of his stories; but
certainly he took many, if not most, of the themes, from older
sources. On the other hand he probably deserves full credit
for the form and style in which they are clothed, and which,
it may be presumed, became largely responsible for the unex-
ampled popularity of the work.

We cannot tell certainly what name the author gave to his
work. It was either Pañcatantra, 'The Textbook consisting
of Five Tantras', or Tantrākhyāyika, 'The Book of Stories
consisting of Tantras'. (On the disputed meaning of *tantra*,
see above.) These two names are found among the oldest

---

[2] See WZKM. 25. 49 ff. Cf. also Thomas, JRAS. 1910. 1347 f.

versions. Most of them use the name Pañcatantra; but of course majority voting does not decide such a matter.

Every version of the Pañcatantra (we shall continue to call the work by the name traditionally given to it, not implying anything as to its original name) which is now known to us has suffered more or less serious revisions—both deliberate and accidental, and in small matters as well as in great. This lies in the nature and character of Hindu literary tradition in general. Literary authorship has always been a matter of small consequence to the Hindus, and plagiarism is a concept which would have no meaning to them. They have always felt as free to deal with the works of others as with their own. Consequently, all versions of the Pañcatantra certainly differ from the original in the addition of certain stories, or in the omission of others, or in both respects. Most of them—in my opinion, all of them—also can be shown to differ from the original rather extensively in matters of detail.

The stories inserted or omitted in the various older versions can be seen at a glance from Hertel's table, page 12 ff.

As to the differences in detail, their name is legion. They may concern mere verbiage—the expression of the same idea in different language. But they may, and often do, concern more or less radical alterations in the story-themes or incidents of the narrative. In a good many cases it is difficult or impossible to determine with certainty what the original reading was, on account of the wide divergence of the versions. In other cases this task is less difficult. But in all cases it is, in the nature of things, a subjective matter, and therefore a more or less dangerous (though very entertaining) pastime. Hertel has, of course, done a great deal of this sort of reconstruction-work—always with great ingenuity, frequently with marked success. Here again, however, one needs to beware of over-enthusiastic confidence in the certainty of such results.

There is a marked difference as to accuracy of transmission between the stanzas and the prose parts of the original. The very fact that the verses were composed in meter made radical changes in them more difficult so long as they remained in the language of the original, and more easily detected. Also, all redactors seem to have attached especial importance to the verses, and taken more than usual pains to preserve them

(frequently adding other similar verses of their own). This is accounted for by the proverbial character of the verses; they sum up the philosophy of the whole work. As a matter of fact, we can to a very large extent reconstruct the verses of the original Pañcatantra. Thus, in Book I, I have counted eighty-two verses which are found in the three oldest prose recensions (the Tantrākhyāyika, the Southern Pañcatantra, and the Pahlavi), and which may therefore with comparative certainty be attributed to the original. Probably those verses which appear in the Tantrākhyāyika and in either the Pahlavi or the Southern Pañcatantra, but not in the other, may—at least for the most part—also be considered to belong to the original. I have found seventy-two such verses in Book I, making a hundred and fifty-four in all. Now the Tantrākhyāyika only contains 185 verses altogether in Book I, and the Southern Pañcatantra only 142,[1] so that it is clear that the older versions have preserved the verses of the original fairly well—at least, much better than the prose.

So much for the original Pañcatantra. We shall now say a few words about each of the older and more important versions.

2.   *The Tantrākhyāyika.*[2]

The chain of events which led to the discovery of this new version of the Pañcatantra is told by Hertel in the introduc-

---

[1] In Hertel's edition 156 are counted, but 14 of these are only found in inferior manuscripts and certainly do not belong to the original Southern Pañcatantra. Of the 142 genuine verses of Book I of SP., 122 are also found in the Tantrākhyāyika. Of about 120 verses in Book I of the Pahlavi (the exact number is not certain because, of course, the translations are all in prose) all but about 10 occur in the Tantrākhyāyika.

[2] Edition: Tantrākhyāyika. Die älteste Fassung des Pañcatantra .... herausgegeben von Johannes Hertel . . . Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1910. (Abhandl. d. kgl. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., N. F., XII. 2.) It is announced that this edition will be reprinted in Prof. C. R. Lanman's Harvard Oriental Series. Translation: Tantrākhyāyika. Die älteste Fassung des Pañcatantra. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen von Johannes Hertel. (2 Bände:) Erster Teil. Einleitung. Zweiter Teil. Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen. 1909. Leipzig und Berlin. Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner.

tion to his translation of it, page 64 and following. He at
once recognized the importance of his find; and in fact, his
natural and proper joy in the discovery led him at first, and
for some time, to somewhat overestimate it. Even in the
preface to his 'Einleitung' to the translation, page 1, he still
speaks of it as 'der alte Urtext des Pañcatantra', although in
the body of the same work he qualifies this statement very
markedly. I have found no such statement in his new book,
'Das Pañcatantra'.

As a matter of fact, the Tantrākhyāyika is far and away the
closest to the original of all the Indian versions of the Pañca-
tantra now known to us. Of this fact I believe there is no
question. All the other Indian versions can be clearly proved
to have been deliberately and radically reconstructed. By this
I do not now mean that they contain additions or omissions,
however extensive. The reconstruction applies to the entire
prose parts of the original work; at most the verses were left
untouched by it. These other versions are really quite new
works. They tell the same stories, but in a wholly new way.
In some of them an abstract has been made of the text. In
others the story is spun out in an easy-going, long-winded
manner by a later narrator, making no attempt at all to keep
to the language of the original. In still others the original
prose has been recast in narrative verse.

In the Tantrākhyāyika none of these things seems to have
been done, at least on an extensive scale. A great many errors
have crept into its text in the course of transmission. Hertel
has pointed out many of them; there are certainly some be-
sides. There are also a number of deliberate and conscious
additions, both of whole new stories and of shorter passages
or verses. I think it can be shown that there are also gaps in
the text—some of them, perhaps, deliberate omissions. But
on the whole the Tantrākhyāyika seems to contain an attempt
to reproduce a text whose main body cannot be very far re-
moved from the original Pañcatantra. If I understand Hertel
correctly, this is all that he now claims for it. No amount of
purely textual blunders in the few known manuscripts of the
text (and such blunders are, unfortunately, numerous) can
alter this fact. Nor can the addition or omission of a few
stories seriously detract from its importance.

I think the strongest proof of this position is the comparatively close correspondence between the wording of the Tantrākhyāyika and that which we can postulate for the very ancient Pahlavi translation (which is now lost) judging by its descendants. Considering all the circumstances, I think with Hertel that this correspondence may fairly be considered remarkably close. It is certainly far closer than that between the Pahlavi and any other known Indian version.

The Tantrākhyāyika manuscripts fall into two divisions, representing somewhat different traditions. Hertel thinks that one of these, which he calls β, is later than the other, a, and contains interpolations and changes introduced from another Pañcatantra version. I am not entirely convinced of this; but since the two subrecensions are practically identical for the most part, the point has not very much importance except for the specialist. The closeness of the two subrecensions is indicated by the fact that Hertel edits them both as one text, and feels free to follow now the one, now the other, when they differ in details, without disturbing the unity and consistency of the whole.

Hertel's German translation, which is so far the only rendering of the Tantrākhyāyika into another language than Sanskrit, should, therefore, by all means be studied by non-Sanskritists who wish to get as good an idea as possible of what the original Pañcatantra was like. It is a very careful and painstaking work. Hertel considered, rightly without doubt, that for comparative purposes—particularly for comparison with the offshoots of the Pahlavi translation—it was necessary to make his German as close and literal a rendering of the Sanskrit as possible. This required a good many parenthetic or foot-note explanations, and made the whole not such smooth reading as might be desired, and as the admirable style of the original deserves. These are, however, unavoidable defects, of which the author is quite conscious. And after all, they are not nearly as serious as one might expect. On the whole, Hertel has succeeded in making a translation that is not only close and accurate, but readable—which is no easy task in dealing with a work of the Hindu 'Kunstliteratur', even with so comparatively simple a one as the Tantrākhyāyika.

3. *The Bṛhatkathā Versions.*

Guṇāḍhya's great Prakrit poem called the Bṛhatkathā or
'Great Story', composed in the Pāiçācī dialect, did not con-
tain any version of the Pañcatantra.[1] But a Kashmirian ver-
sion of it, made sometime before the eleventh century A. D.,
contained an abbreviated recast of the Pañcatantra, apparently
in separate sections (each *tantra* of the original by itself, and
separated from the others by extraneous matter).[2] This Kash-
mirian Bṛhatkathā was translated into Sanskrit verse by two
different men, within a few years of each other: by Kṣemen-
dra in the first half of the eleventh century, and by Somadeva
in the latter half thereof. We need concern ourselves here
only with the sections of their works containing the Pañca-
tantra. As to these sections, Kṣemendra,[3] according to Hertel,
treated his original with great freedom, and interpolated from
a text of the Tantrākhyāyika a considerable amount of mate-
rial which his original did not contain. These facts appear to
be pretty well proven. They make Kṣemendra's work of little
critical value. As it happens, it is of little literary value also.

Much more important from every point of view is Soma-
deva's version, found in his work commonly known as the
Kathāsaritsāgara; its true name probably was Bṛhatkathāsa-
ritsāgara, or 'Ocean of the Streams of the Bṛhatkathā (Great
Story)'.[4]

[1] On this subject compare Lacôte, Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et le Bṛhatka-
thā, Paris, 1908; especially, p. 131 f., and p. 229.

[2] So it is still found in Somadeva, in five sections separated from
each other by considerable passages of other materials. See below,
note 4.

[3] Edition of Kṣemendra's entire work: The Bṛihatkathāmañjarī of
Kshemendra. Edited by Mahāmahopādyāya Paṇḍit Śivadatta . . . and
Kāshīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab . . . . Nirṇaya-Sāgara Press. Bombay,
1901. (Kāvyamālā 69.) The Pañc. is found on pp. 561 ff. of this edi-
tion, which Hertel says is very poor.

A better edition of the Pañcatantra section alone, with a German
translation, is the following: Der Auszug aus dem Pañcatantra in
Kshemendras Bṛhatkathāmañjarī. Einleitung, Text, Uebersetzung und
Anmerkungen von Leo von Mańkowski, Dr. iur. et phil. Leipzig, Otto
Harrassowitz, 1892. Even this edition Hertel finds not very critical.

[4] Compare Speyer, Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara, Amsterdam,
1908. There are two editions of this work as a whole: (1) Kathā
Sarit Sāgara. Die Märchensammlung des Somadeva. Herausgegeben

Somadeva's version is of course verbally very remote from the original, having passed through two translations, and being furthermore put into a versified form. Even the verses of the original, which in all the other older versions are so well preserved, are almost obliterated in Somadeva (as in Kṣemendra). But the essence of the stories is preserved, and in a very ancient form. In particular there are few omissions of stories belonging to the original, and—in my opinion—no interpolations of stories. I think there is no good reason to doubt that every story contained in Somadeva belonged to the original Pañcatantra.[1]

Somadeva tells the stories of the Pañcatantra freely, in his own words, and in his own graceful and attractive style. In the thread of the narratives he follows his original closely. Where he departs from it he tends in general to abbreviate, leaving out details which seemed to him unessential. This abbreviation in part goes back to his original, the Kashmirian Bṛhatkathā. But he seems not to have contaminated his text

---

von Hermann Brockhaus. Leipzig, F. A. Brockhaus; Part I, Books 1-5, 1839; Part II, Books 6-8, 1862; Part III, Books 9-18, 1866. (The last two parts = Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, II. 5 and IV. 5. The Pañcatantra on p. 111 ff. of Part III, AKM. IV. 5.) (2) The Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadevabhatta. Edited by Paṇḍit Durgāprasād and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab . . . . Nirṇaya-Sāgara Press, Bombay, 1889. (Pañcatantra on p. 355 ff.) 2d Edition, 1903. (Pañcatantra on p. 309 ff.) Neither of these editions is in any sense a critical one; on the whole the second is rather better than the first (cf. Speyer, op. cit., p. 61 ff.). Precisely speaking, the Pañcatantra is contained in the following sections of the Kathāsaritsāgara: Book 1 of the Pañcatantra, in Somadeva, Chapter 60. 11-254; Book 2, in 61. 58-139; Book 3, in 62. 5-167; Book 4, in 63. 97-153; Book 5, in 64. 3-12. (These numbers are taken from the edition of Brockhaus; those in Durgāprasād and Parab's edition are slightly different.)

Somadeva's work has been translated into English: The Kathá Sarit Ságara or Ocean of the Streams of Story, translated . . . by C. H. Tawney, M. A. (2 vols.), Calcutta (Bibliotheca Indica), 1880 and 1884. The Pañcatantra is found on pp. 27-43, 48-52, 64-75, 84-87, and 90-91 of Vol. 2 of this excellent translation.

[1] Winternitz, Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1910, p. 2761, calls attention to this fact. Hertel indeed believes that Somadeva's original contained a few stories which did not belong to the Urpañcatantra; but I think with Winternitz that his grounds are insufficient. I hope to show this in a later publication.

with other versions of the tales, nor to have drawn to any extent on his own invention. Consequently, the appearance of a story or of a motive in Somadeva is prima facie (though of course not decisive) evidence that it belonged to the original Pañcatantra. On the other hand, the failure of a story or of a motive to appear in Somadeva does not necessarily prove that it was not in the original. It can be shown that (perhaps by accident) he omitted one or two original stories; and in the general abbreviation of the work he, or his immediate original, left out many small details.

4. *The Southern Pañcatantra and related versions* (*the Nepalese text, the Hitopadeça*).

These three versions go back to an abstract (called by Hertel 'n-w') of a Pañcatantra text, made at a time which cannot be determined further than that it was apparently later than the time of Kālidāsa—that is, later than the fifth century A. D. This seems to be shown by the fact that it contained a quotation from Kālidāsa's Kumārasaṁbhava.

There seems to be good reason to suppose that in the Southern Pañcatantra[1] we have virtually the exact text of

[1] A very imperfect edition by Michael Haberlandt was published in the Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akad. der Wiss. zu Wien, ph.-hist. Kl., Bd. 107. p. 397 ff. It is now entirely superseded by the following edition: Das Südliche Pañcatantra. Sanskrittext der Rezension β mit den Lesarten der besten Hss. der Rezension α herausgegeben von Johannes Hertel. Leipzig, Teubner, 1906. (Abh. d. ph.-hist. Kl. d. kgl. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., Bd. XXIV, No. V.) No translation of the Southern Pañcatantra has yet appeared. The best sub-recension of the SP. is the one which Hertel calls α. Because he found the materials insufficient for a complete text of this recension alone, he chose to print complete the text of the β recension, giving in his critical notes the variants of α. This resulted in making his text as printed considerably less original than it might have been. For instance, the printed text contains a large number of verses inserted in β alone, which certainly did not belong to the archetype. In many readings of detail, too, Hertel has deliberately inserted inferior readings of the β mss., although his α mss. furnished the correct readings. It seems to me very unfortunate that Hertel did not do with the SP. what he afterwards did with the Tantrākhyāyika, give a text which would attempt to reproduce the SP. archetype, rather than any one single sub-recension. The cases are exactly analogous; the various sub-recensions of SP. are really no more independent versions than those of the Tantrākhyāyika and there

this abstract, barring the usual numerous manuscript blunders. This text is, like that of Somadeva, a deliberate recast—in the main, as we have said, an abstract. But, again like Somadeva, it contains a few—though *very* few—insertions. The only one of its stories which is certainly interpolated is I. 12, the Shepherdess and her Lover. In general it follows the main drift of the original narrative quite closely. Moreover, unlike Somadeva, it preserves very well, in general, the verses of the original (cf. above, p. 52, n. 1). Not many verses were inserted in its archetype; nor were very many omitted. The prose text has, nevertheless, suffered by its abbreviation. In many places essential details of the story are almost or quite crowded out, in the striving for brevity.

The Nepalese Pañcatantra and the Hitopadeça go back jointly to a recast of the abstract which forms the basis of the Southern Pañcatantra. To this recast Hertel gives the name of ' n–w [2] ', thus distinguishing it from the original abstract, which he calls ' n–w '.[1]

This recast, n–w [2], was in general very close to n–w and hence to the Southern Pañcatantra. But it was peculiar in this respect—that it transposed the first two books of the Pañcatantra, making Book II Book I, and vice versa. Otherwise

---

is no reason for dignifying them to any greater extent. What we wanted of Hertel was a text of the SP. archetype—not a text containing all the obviously secondary blunders of an inferior recension of SP., when the true readings were at hand. As it is, we have to work painfully and laboriously through his critical apparatus to correct his printed text and arrive at the real SP. text.

[1] In his ' Stammbaum ' of the Pañc. versions (Pañcatantra, p. 426) Hertel postulates the existence of an ' n–w [1] ', an intermediate stage between the abstract n–w and the Southern Pañcatantra (SP.). This I think is unprovable. On p. 432 of op. cit. he refers, for proof of the existence of this ' n–w [1] ', to his edition of SP., Introduction, pp. XXXVI–XLIII and XLVI–LI. Nothing in those pages seems to me to prove the point. They contain what Hertel thinks to have been corruptions in the archetype of SP., but nearly all of these supposed corruptions are found also in the Nepalese Pañc. (Hertel's n), so that they must in any case belong to the original abstract n–w. The exceptions concern passages which are not preserved in the Nep. Pañc., so that certainly they do not prove that the true and original text of SP. (as distinguished from the inferior recension β, printed by Hertel) contained any corruptions which were not also found in ' n–w [2] ', the archetype of the Nep. Pañc. and the Hit.

it seems hardly to have differed from the archetype of the Southern Pañcatantra any more than the individual manuscripts and sub-recensions of the Southern Pañcatantra differ from that archetype and from each other. In matters of detail it of course had a good many slight differences. In some cases these variants are better—that is, more original—than those preserved in the standard manuscripts of the Southern Pañcatantra; in other cases they are inferior.

The Nepalese Pañcatantra is known at present only in a single ancient manuscript which preserves *only* the verses of the original. Its redactor, for some reason which is not clear to us, simply went through the text and took out all the verses, omitting the prose. (The order of the verses keeps strictly to that of the original.) Cases are known in which the same thing was done with other Hindu works composed in mingled prose and verse; the famous Phayre manuscript contains only the verses of the Jātakas, and a manuscript of the Hitopadeça containing verses almost exclusively, is known (Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 38).

At least, such was the evident intention of the author of this text (called by Hertel *v*).[1] As a matter of fact, the single manuscript we have does not contain all the verses which we may fairly suppose (from the evidence of the Southern Pañcatantra and the Hitopadeça) were in his original, n–w [2]. The reason for this probably is that the redactor failed to recognize as verse some of the verses of his original. Hindu manuscripts never make any indication of differences of this sort, except that occasionally—but by no means always—they write numerals at the end of verses. There is never any break in the line of writing. For the converse reason, evidently, this Nepalese manuscript took into its text one prose passage, mistaking it for a verse. The closeness with which this prose sentence agrees with the corresponding one of the Southern Pañcatantra is an additional indication of the close connection of the archetypes of these two texts, and incidentally proves that the Nepalese Pañcatantra is based on a full text containing both prose and verses.

[1] Edited: Introduction and Books I–III incl., in the Anmerkungen to Hertel's edition of the Southern Pañcatantra, p. 117 ff.: Books IV–V, in Hertel's edition of the Tantrākhyāyika, Introduction, p. XXVII.

The Hitopadeça [1] is the first instance we have met—if we except Kṣemendra, which contains a few interpolations apparently from a Tantrākhyāyika text—of a composite version, that is one which consciously and deliberately undertook to fuse several texts, or parts of them, into one.

The author of the Hitopadeça gives his own name as Nārāyaṇa. His life must fall between about the years 800 and 1373 A. D., the latter being the date of the oldest manuscript. We cannot determine it more accurately. The Hitopadeça is known principally in Bengal, and is the only Pañcatantra version known there to any extent. For this and certain other reasons Hertel holds to the plausible opinion that the author was a native of Bengal.

The author tells us that his work was based upon 'the Pañcatantra and another work'. We do not know what the other work was, but apparently it was a collection of fables, from which Nārāyaṇa drew those of his stories which are not taken from the Pañcatantra. From internal evidence we can tell that the version of the Pañcatantra which he used was a recension of 'n–w [2]', the recast of the abstract which we have in the Southern Pañcatantra. This same recast, we have seen, was the text from which the Nepalese redactor excerpted the verses for his recension 'v'. This is sufficiently proved by the mere fact that Books I and II of the original are transposed in v and in the Hitopadeça, and in them alone of the

---

[1] Edited and translated repeatedly, but a really good critical edition is yet to be made. The two best editions are the following. (1) Hitopadesas id est institutio salutaris .... Augustus Gulielmus a Schlegel et Christianus Lassen. Pars I. Textum Sanscritum tenens. (The promised translation never appeared.) Bonnae ... MDCCCXXIX. Pars II. commentarium criticum tenens. Bonnae ... MDCCCXXXI. (2) Hitopadeśa by Nârâyana. Edited by Peter Peterson .... Bombay: Government Central Book Depot. 1887. (Bombay Sanskrit Series No. XXXIII.)

The two best translations are the German ones of Fritze (Hitopadeça ... aus dem Sanskrit neu übersetzt von Ludwig Fritze. Leipzig, Verlag von Otto Wigand, 1888), and Hertel (Hitopadesa. Die freundliche Belehrung ... von Johannes Hertel. Leipzig, Druck und Verlag von Philipp Reclam jun. No date, but 1895). A free but charming rendering in English is contained in the following: The Book of Good Counsels from the Sanskrit of the 'Hitopadeśa'. By Sir Edwin Arnold ... London: W. H. Allen and Co. .... 1896.

versions known to us. Furthermore the verses of the Hito-
padeça have a large number of readings peculiar to it and
to *v.*

In the prose text of those stories which the Hitopadeça took
from the Pañcatantra it agrees in general quite closely with
the Southern Pañcatantra—another proof of the relationship
as stated, and an evidence of Nārāyaṇa's faithfulness as a
redactor. But as to the order of the individual stories, the
author of the Hitopadeça allowed himself great freedom. He
was, indeed, as we have seen, not responsible for the trans-
position of Books I and II of the Pañcatantra. But he did
introduce much more sweeping changes. He omitted Book
IV altogether, and split Book III into two books, into which
he put the stories of Pañcatantra Book V and many of those
of Book I (a disproportionately long book in the original).
He has, then, only four books in all; and these four are
much more nearly equal in length than the books of the Pañca-
tantra. The desire to equalize the length of the books was
perhaps his motive in introducing these changes. Besides, as
we have indicated, the Hitopadeça contains quite a number of
stories which do not occur in the Pañcatantra, and were pre-
sumably taken from the 'other work' to which the author
refers. The work also contains a large number of inserted
verses. Many of these are quoted from Kāmandaki's Nītisāra,
a kind of textbook of policy.

5. *The Jainistic versions (the so-called textus simplicior,
and Pūrṇabhadra's recension, sometimes called
the textus ornatior).*

All the versions mentioned in the last two chapters—Bṛhat-
kathā versions, the Southern Pañcatantra and its relatives—
contain abstracts of the Pañcatantra in some form or other.

The versions we are now to deal with contain, on the con-
trary, expanded texts.

The so-called textus simplicior (the rather inappropriate
name, which goes back to Kosegarten, is kept for want of a
better one) was compiled certainly before 1199 A. D., when it
was used by Pūrṇabhadra for his new version, and probably
not earlier than the tenth century.[1] On the whole there seem

[1] Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 71 f., and references there quoted.

to be fair reasons for believing with Hertel [1] that the author was a Jaina. The seemingly most original manuscripts of the text call it ' the textbook of conduct called Pañcākhyānaka ('consisting of five tales '), with the alternative name of Pañcatantra '.

This version has long been, and is today, the best-known Pañcatantra text of northwest and central India. It has enjoyed such an immense popularity that it has entirely supplanted the older versions in those parts of India. This popularity is, incidentally, responsible for the fact that the text is poorly preserved to us. It has been since early times so extensively copied that it has suffered greatly at the hands of the copyists. Many changes, both accidental and deliberate, in the details of the text, have been introduced in its manuscripts, with the result that, while we have a large number of manuscripts of it, they vary so among each other that it is almost impossible to be sure of the original text. No one— not even the indefatigable Hertel—has as yet dared to attempt a really critical edition.[2]

[1] See his elaborate discussion, ' Ueber die Jaina-Rezensionen des Pañcatantra ', Ber. Verh. KSGW. ph.-hist. Kl. 1902, 23 ff., especially 62 ff. He summarizes his arguments in Pañcatantra, p. 72 f. Some of them seem to me weak, and perhaps all of them may be described as more or less subjective and indecisive. Cf. my remarks, AJP. 33. 273 ff. Nevertheless I feel with Hertel that the general flavor of the work suggests Jainism. 'Subjective' this opinion is, if you like; for I do not think it can be clearly proved. I certainly do not think, as Hertel does, that there is any reason for calling the author specifically a Çvetāmbara Jain.

[2] If we except Kosegarten, whose text was indeed such an attempt, but who failed in it so lamentably that both his text and the various translations made from it are quite worthless from a critical standpoint. His edition (with a Latin title, ' Pantschatantrum. . .') appeared at Bonn in 1848. It really contains a hodge-podge of the real textus simplicior, Pūrṇabhadra, and other Sanskrit versions. Blundering reprints thereof are the texts printed in India under the ' editorship' (!) of Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara (Calcutta, 6th ed., 1899) and K. P. Parab (Bombay, 1896; 2d ed. by M. G. Shastri Bakre 1906).

An intelligent edition, which is however of little critical value since it is based on a single imperfect manuscript, is that published in the Bombay Sanskrit Series under the title Pañchatantra. BSS. I (Bombay 1868) contains Pañc. Books IV and V, edited by G. Bühler: BSS. III (1868), Pañc. Books II and III, also by Bühler: BSS. IV (1869), Pañc. (Introduction and) Book I, by F. Kielhorn. In default of a critical text this is the best available edition. On it is based the German

This lack of any certainty as to the form of the original textus simplicior (it is unique among the Sanskrit versions in this respect) makes it more than usually difficult to determine its relation to other versions. Even Hertel seems to lose his usual confidence when he attempts to discuss this question. For my part, I think we shall have to wait for a careful critical edition, based on a study of all available manuscripts, before we can hope to settle the matter—if, indeed, we can settle it even then.

This much appears to be clear, that the author of the textus simplicior dealt very freely with his original, and in particular that he was not at all concerned with keeping it within small limits. On the contrary, he spins it out, both by his leisurely and easy-going style (which makes it very good reading, and probably accounts for its extraordinary popularity), and by adding a considerable number of new stories. These new stories are mostly found in Book V, which is indeed a wholly new creation; it contains the stories of Book V of the old Pañcatantra, but most of its stories are quite new. Even the frame story is different. Moreover, a number of stories which were found in Book III of the old Pañcatantra are here transferred to Book IV; and some new stories are added here and there throughout the work. The purpose of these additions and changes in the order of the stories seems to have been mainly a desire to equalize the space occupied by the different books. We have seen that the author of the Hitopadeça seems to have been actuated by a similar desire. In the original Pañcatantra Books IV and V, especially the latter, were very short. In the textus simplicior all the books are more nearly of the same length.

The textus simplicior preserves in large part the verses of the original Pañcatantra, though—apparently—with more verbal variations than are found in the other older versions. It

---

translation of Fritze (Pantschatantra. . . . Leipzig, Otto Schulze, 1884), as well as the Dutch rendering of van der Waals (Leiden 1895-7. 3 vols.). On Kosegarten's miserable text are based the German version of Benfey (above, p. 44, n. 1), the French of Édouard Lancereau (Pantschatantra. . . Paris, 1871), the Italian of Italo Pizzi (Le novelle indiane di Visnusarma [Panciatantra] Torino, 1896), and the Danish of Rasmussen (De ældeste indiske æventyr og fabler. . . København, 1893).

also inserts a very considerable number of new verses.   In the prose parts it treats its original or originals with the greatest freedom.   In fact, it seems to have made no attempt whatever to reproduce the *language* of the text or texts which it used. It tells the stories very freely in its own way.   At least, this appears to be the case, in the light of our present imperfect knowledge.   When we have a good critical edition of the text, perhaps it will cause us to modify some of these statements.

At present we do not even know what materials the author of the textus simplicior used.   Hertel thinks that he based his version in the first instance on an unabridged northwestern recension of the Pañcatantra, closely similar to that which was used for the abstract found in the Southern Pañcatantra, the Nepalese version, and the Hitopadeça; but that he also used in spots a manuscript of the Tantrākhyāyika, and probably still other recensions now lost to us.   Since the Tantrākhyāyika is the only one of these postulated materials now preserved, or at least known to us, it is evident that the question is very difficult and problematic.   Without intending to intimate that I have any theory superior to Hertel's, I may say that in a somewhat careful study of Book I I have found remarkably few traces of any specially close relation between the textus simplicior and the Southern Pañcatantra or its related versions.

We are on much surer ground when we come to the second Jainistic recension, which is the last of the Sanskrit Pañcatantra versions which we shall treat in this article.   It is the work of the Jain monk Pūrṇabhadra, and was completed in the year 1199 A. D.[1]

Pūrṇabhadra's work is based mainly on the textus simplicior

[1] Edition: The Panchatantra . . . in the Recension . . . of . . . Pūrṇabhadra.   Critically edited . . . by Dr. Johannes Hertel . . . Cambridge, Massachusetts . . . 1908.   (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. XI.)—The Panchatantra-Text of Pūrṇabhadra.   Critical Introduction and List of Variants by Dr. Johannes Hertel . . . Cambridge . . . 1912.   (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. XII.)—The following is a German rendering of what is practically the text of Pūrṇabhadra, though containing some interpolations taken from inferior manuscripts, and not corresponding in all details to the text of Hertel's edition (cf. Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 99, and HOS. XII. 44 ff.) : Das Pañcatantram (Textus ornatior) . . . Zum ersten Male übersetzt von Richard Schmidt. Leipzig, Lotusverlag. (No date: appeared in 1901.)

and the Tantrākhyāyika. Whether or not he also used some other recensions—perhaps some now lost to us—as Hertel thinks probable, may be considered questionable; it is certainly quite possible that he did. He interpolates a few stories and quite a good many verses found in neither of his two main sources. And occasionally, even in stories which he has copied from them, he allows himself considerable liberties with the verbiage of the text. His changes are mostly in the line of expansions and additions; hence the name 'textus ornatior', which since Kosegarten's time has commonly been given to this version. But in the main he follows fairly closely, both in great things and in small, one or the other of his two principal sources. Generally speaking, his text looks like a mosaic of the Tantrākhyāyika and the textus simplicior.

In the general order of the work he follows the Tantrākhyāyika, except that his entire fifth book is taken over bodily from the textus simplicior (which, as we saw, has a fifth book that is a new creation of its own), and excepting also a part of the third book, where he likewise follows the textus simplicior. In details he does not adhere consistently to either text for long at a time, but weaves the two into each other, with occasional passages not found in either.

In this short article it is impossible to carry further the history of the Pañcatantra in India. A large number of later versions are known, written either in Sanskrit or in the medieval and modern vernaculars. They are all discussed at length in Hertel's new book. It is particularly interesting to note how many of them Hertel finds to contain fusions of various older recensions, or parts thereof. Sometimes individual books of different recensions are put together into a single new recension; sometimes, as in the case of Pūrṇabhadra, a mosaic text is made of two complete recensions. All of these late recasts are of minor interest for the general student.

6. *The Pahlavi translation and its offshoots.*

A Persian physician named Burzōe or Burzuyeh, living under the patronage of King Chosrau Anōsharwān (531–579 A. D.), made a translation into Pahlavi of a number of Indian stories, the chief of which was a version of the Pañcatantra.

5

He seems to have called his whole work by the name of
'Karaṭaka and Damanaka' (to use the Sanskrit forms of the
names), after the two jackals who play such an important part
in the story of the first book of the Pañcatantra.

Burzōe's work is unhappily lost; but through secondary
versions of it which are preserved we can form a good idea
of what it contained—especially of the Pañcatantra section.

From these secondary versions we can tell that the Indian
text used by Burzōe was not very far removed from the
original Pañcatantra, and from the Tantrākhyāyika.   In fact,
the correspondence between the Pahlavi and the Tantrākhyā-
yika, which is very much closer than that between the Pahlavi
and any other Indian version, is one of the best proofs of the
antiquity and comparative originality of both.

This correspondence would undoubtedly be much closer than
it is, were it not for the fact that the Pahlavi is after all only
a translation, and a rather imperfect one.   It is most unfor-
tunate that we do not possess the Indian original on which it
was based.   The translator seems to have intended to be
faithful.   But his knowledge of Sanskrit, and of Indian insti-
tutions, was evidently faulty in the extreme.   In many cases
he obviously misunderstood even quite simple phrases.   And
difficult passages he almost regularly misunderstood, or—very
often—omitted altogether, evidently because he could not make
head or tail out of them.   The verses of the original suffered
especially.   They are, in fact, much more difficult than the
prose, on the whole.   And they are much more poorly pre-
served in the Pahlavi than in any Sanskrit version except those
of the Br̥hatkathā, which go back immediately to a Prakrit
original, and show scarcely any signs of the Sanskrit verses.

Barring these natural defects, the Pahlavi translation was
close and accurate; and in spite of them, it is of the greatest
value for us, and helps us enormously to get closer to the
original Pañcatantra.

As has been said, we know Burzōe's version only through
its descendants.   Two versions of it were made at a compara-
tively early time: one in Old Syriac,[1] discovered through

---

[1] First edited by G. Bickell (Kalilag und Damnag ... Text und deut-
sche Uebersetzung.   Mit einer Einleitung von Theodor Benfey.   Leip-
zig 1876).   This edition and translation are now superseded by the

a romantic chain of fortunate circumstances in the early seventies of the last century, and the other in Arabic. The Old Syriac exists only in one single manuscript, and it has left no known descendants—translations or recasts. It was made from Burzōe's Pahlavi by a certain Būd about 570 A. D., perhaps in Burzōe's own lifetime. On the whole it seems to have been a closer and better version of the Pahlavi than the Arabic, although the unique manuscript is unfortunately very corrupt, as well as fragmentary.

The Arabic[1] translation of the Pahlavi was made by Abdallah Ibn al Muqaffa' about 750 A. D., and bears the title ' Kalila and Dimna' (*Kalīlah wa Dimnah*). From it are descended the many medieval European and Asiatic versions which have carried the stories of the Pañcatantra into almost every part of the world.

A complete sketch of these direct or indirect descendants of the Arabic is found in the eleventh chapter of Hertel's Pañcatantra. Space permits me to mention only a few of the more important by way of indication of the extraordinary history of the work.

---

following: Kalila und Dimna. Syrisch und Deutsch. Von Friedrich Schulthess. Berlin, Reimer, 1911. I. Syrischer Text. II. Uebersetzung. The translation has valuable critical and comparative notes, with additions by Hertel, and it is throughout provided with marginal references to the corresponding sections of the Tantrākhyāyika, which constitute a valuable aid for quick comparisons.

[1] First edition by Sylvestre de Sacy, Calila et Dimna ou Fables de Bidpai. Paris 1816. This is a composite text of several sub-recensions, and gives a poor picture of the original Arabic. On it are based the following translations: English, by Knatchbull, Oxford (*not* London !) 1819; reprinted Cairo 1905. (A very loose rendering, which deliberately alters the text where it does not come up to the pious Englishman's standards of propriety.) German, by Holmboe and Hansen (Christiania 1832), and by Wolff (Stuttgart 1837; 2nd ed. 1839). French, by Pihan (Algiers 1886). Also Danish and Russian versions.

The Arabic text has been repeatedly printed in the Orient; the various texts are all uncritical and differ among one another, being based mostly on single manuscripts, or else—still worse—on de Sacy's edition. The manuscripts are numerous and differ widely from each other. The best existing text is that of L. Cheikho (Beyrouth 1905), which is based on a single very old manuscript, An English translation of this text is planned by Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania.

'Kalila and Dimna' was translated into Old Spanish by an unknown author about 1251.[1] The Arabic version from which this rendering was taken was extremely close to that which formed the basis of the older Hebrew version, by Rabbi Joel, composed early in the 12th century.[2] Joel's Hebrew was done into Latin by John of Capua, a Jew convert to Christianity, between 1263 and 1278; this Latin text was twice printed about the year 1480, and also exists in a number of manuscripts.[3] It bore the double title *Liber Kelilae et Dimnae—Directorium vitae humanae*. From it was made the very famous '*Buch der Beispiele der alten Weisen*', by Anthonius von Pforr, a German priest of Rottenburg on the Neckar. Pforr's work was first published, without indication of place or date, about the year 1480. It soon attained an enormous popularity, was printed over and over again, was translated into various other European languages, and remained for a number of centuries the chief source of knowledge of the Pañcatantra in Europe. This was partly due to the excellence of the literary style of its author.

John of Capua's Latin text was also translated into Spanish in 1493 (*Exemplario contra los engaños y peligros del mundo*), by Paul Hurus, a German by birth. An Italian named Doni translated the Latin text into Italian (printed at Venice in 1552); he divided it into two parts, one called *La Moral Filosophia*, the other *Trattati diversi di Sendebar Indiano filosopho morale*. The first part alone was reprinted a number of times, and is of interest to us as being the original of Sir Thomas North's '*The Morall Philosophie of Doni*', the first English version of any Pañcatantra text. This was published in London in 1570, reprinted in 1601, and recently reprinted again under the editorship of Joseph Jacobs (London, 1888).

[1] Edited by Clifford G. Allen (*L'ancienne version espagnole de Kalila et Dimna*), Macon, 1906.

[2] Edited with French translation by J. Derenbourg, Paris, 1881. (Bibl. de l'éc. des hautes ét. 49.) The same work contains also an edition of Jacob ben Eleazar's later Hebrew translation (13th cent.).

[3] The two early printed texts were reprinted, the one by J. Derenbourg at Paris in 1887 (Bibl. de l'éc. des hautes ét. 72), the other by L. Hervieux, Paris, 1899.

The other principal direct translations of the Arabic are the Greek Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης of Symeon Seth, late in the eleventh century (translated into Latin several times, into German, and into a number of Slavic languages); the younger Syriac (10th or 11th century), translated into English by Keith-Falconer (Cambridge 1885); the Persian of Naṣrallah (12th century), which was translated into various Turkish dialects, and further served as the basis for the better-known Persian recast called the *Anwāri Suhailī*, of Husain Ibn ʿAli al–Wāʿiẓ. This latter has itself wandered directly or indirectly into most European languages. The Kalila and Dimna has even traveled as far as the Malay peninsula; in the Malay language it appears under the title *Hikāyat Kalila dan Dimna*.

In a continuation of this article, which will appear in an early number of this journal, I shall express more precisely my attitude towards the details of Hertel's 'genealogical table' of the versions of the Pañcatantra, printed on p. 426 of his 'Pañcatantra'. Although it will be seen from the preceding account that I accept most of his important conclusions therein expressed, I have misgivings about a number of details, to some of which Hertel seems to me to attribute an exaggerated importance.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

IV.—A WITTICISM OF ASINIUS POLLIO.

The earliest mention of Asinius Pollio is found in the twelfth poem of Catullus, where in contrast to the tasteless practical joking of his brother, Asinius Marrucinus, he is called *leporum disertus puer ac facetiarum*. But the pleasant humor of the youth became with years a mordant wit which spared no one. In the literary memoirs of the elder Seneca he appears as a critic of the ineptitudes and extravagances of the declaimers. A phrase of declamatory sensationalism by Q. Haterius, we are told,[1] yielded *magnam materiam Pollionis Asinii iocis*, and again,[2] apropos of a pseudo-pathetic utterance of one Triarius, *hoc belle deridebat Asinius Pollio*. Asinius was a notorious carper in matters of literary style, and it was with him doubtless a matter of temperament, but partly also of principle—as of one holding with fervor a well defined point of view from which he judged all that was divergent. Seneca speaks of his criticism as rigorous, harsh, and angry—*strictum et asperum et nimis iratum iudicium*.[3] That it was used wholesomely enough on the celebrities of the rhetorical schools we may believe, but it did not spare the greatest of his contemporaries. His criticisms upon Caesar and Sallust we may pass over, but I would pause a moment to consider his censure of Cicero. It is reported by Quintilian, who referring to Brutus and Calvus as critics of Cicero names also the Asinii, father and son, *qui vitia orationis eius etiam inimice pluribus locis insequuntur*.[4] The point of view from which their criticism took its rise was that of a subtle purity of idiomatic and urbane usage, which they pursued with the fervor of a religious cult. They aimed to create for Latin a standard of purity comparable to Atticism in Greek; they were the custodians of its standards—*verborum pensitatores subtilissimi*, as Gellius says; they were the initiates into sacred mysteries

---

[1] Controv. IV Praef. 11.   [2] Op. cit. II 3, 19.
[3] Op. cit. IV Praef. 3.
[4] Inst. Or. XII 1, 22. Cf. Gellius XVII 1, 1.

not vouchsafed to others.[1] For them *Latinitas* (or *Latine loqui*) was the supreme formulation of their creed and comprehended all the refinements of faultless idiom based upon usage and theory.   The pains which Calvus bestowed upon the attainment of this ideal are well known from Cicero's characterization;[2] Messala in the words of the elder Seneca was *Latini sermonis* (i. e. *Latinitatis*) *observator diligentissimus*;[3] and of Pollio himself Quintilian says: *summa diligentia, adeo ut quibusdam etiam nimia videatur*.[4]

It lies in the nature of things that rhetorical abundance and amplitude of style should be not only antipathic to the worshippers of a purity so strict and austere, but also that such a style should expose itself more often to the reproach of carelessness or positive error.   It is easy also to see how a superior elegance should be felt to reside in language of restrained propriety as compared with figure, metaphor, and rhetorical exuberance generally.   If Asinius found fault with the diction of Cicero it is not strange that Livy furnished a mark for one of his shafts.   The conditions of antipathy were present on other than stylistic grounds.   As an historian Livy was in some degree at all events a rival of Asinius, and in the political partizanships which survived the civil wars, it is probable that they were arrayed on opposite sides.

While I have now made it plain that I propose to speak of the Patavinity of Livy, let me hasten to disclaim any purpose of renewing the search for that mysterious quality.   Balzac, the epistolographer and satirist of the early 17th century, created a type of learned futility who, amongst other achievements of like character, professed to have found the secret of Livy's Patavinity, and Bernhardy speaks of the subject as one that has been pursued "bis zur Lächerlichkeit".   That inquiry I shall not pursue, but even at the risk of involving myself in the reproach of futility which attaches to the whole subject, I shall venture to advance some explanations which seem to me to cast light on the form and spirit of Pollio's dictum.

[1] Quint. XII 10, 14.   [2] Brutus 283.   [3] Seneca Controv. II 4, 8.
[4] X 1, 113. On the whole subject see the very interesting study of Professor C. N. Smiley "'Ελληνισμός and Latinitas ", Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 143 (1906).

Quintilian, who is our source of information, and the only one, advocating a definition of *Latinitas* not too restricted, refers to the censure which Lucilius had passed upon one Vettius for using words of Tuscan, Sabine, and Praenestine dialect, and adds, *quemadmodum Pollio reprehendit in Livio Patavinitatem.*[1] Again in illustration of the observation that the style of some writers or speakers was so carefully studied as to lose native color (*multos invenies quos curiose potius loqui dixeris quam Latine*), he tells the story of the market woman of Athens who detected the foreign birth of Theophrastus because his speech was *nimis Attice*, and as a Roman illustration of the same sort of thing he adds, *et in Tito Livio putat inesse Pollio Asinius quandam Patavinitatem.*[2] The whole context, as well as the use of *quandam*, shows that Quintilian considered the criticism oversubtle, and was himself ignorant of the quality which Pollio professed to find. He gives no clue to the place or connection in which the judgment was uttered, and one can only speculate whether it was based upon the private reading of Livy's history, upon impressions derived from a public recitation of some part of it, or upon rhetorical declamations of the kind which furnished recreation for even the most distinguished literary men of the time. The story of Theophrastus would also suggest that the quality criticised in Livy might have been one of pronunciation rather than of style. It is worth while to keep the various possibilities in mind, remembering that a judgment upon the style of Livy's history is only one of several alternatives.

Livy, though not certainly a public teacher of rhetoric, was yet, like Asinius himself and most other literary men of the time, concerned with the theory and practice of rhetoric, and must have been a frequenter of the halls of declamation and recitation. His son-in-law, L. Magius, was a declaimer who had his following,[3] and some of the critical utterances of Livy which Seneca reports indicate a lively participation in the contemporary life of letters which centered in these schools. In some such connection an occasion may easily have been afforded to Asinius for his mysterious thrust. One's imagination may be helped by an illustration, even though it have

[1] I 5, 56.   [2] VIII 1, 3.
[3] Seneca. Controv. X Praef. 2.

no direct bearing on our question. On one occasion at the house of Messala, Sextilius Ena, a Spanish poet, began a recitation on the death of Cicero with the verse, *deflendus Cicero est Latiaeque silentia Linguae. Pollio Asinius,* Seneca continues, *non aequo animo tulit et ait:* ' *Messala, tu quid tibi liberum sit in domo tua videris; ego istum auditurus non sum cui mutus videor',* atque ita consurrexit.[1]

But now to the Patavinity itself, which I shall endeavor to explain by another illustration drawn likewise from the entertaining pages of Seneca's literary gossip. Porcius Latro was accounted one of the cleverest declaimers of the time. His oratory was florid, diffuse, and sententious. For us he is most intelligibly characterized by Seneca's assertion that Ovid was his ardent admirer, and transferred many of his *sententiae* to his own verse. A Spaniard by birth he had never overcome a certain vigorous roughness characteristic of Spanish speech —*illum fortem et agrestem et Hispanae consuetudinis morem non poterat dediscere.*[2] He was in short the very type of stylist and speaker whom we should expect to find wholly antipathetic to elegant purists like Asinius and Messala. On one occasion, as Seneca records,[3] Messala heard him declaim, and replying (we may assume) to inquiries as to his impression he said with laconic brevity, *sua lingua disertus*—"eloquent, yes; but in his own tongue ", thas is, not in Latin; or as Seneca explains, *ingenium illi concessit, sermonem obiecit.* The shaft was keen and must have cut deep. Latro to whose ears it came did not acquiesce (*non tulit hanc contumeliam*), but took vengeance by such weapons as he commanded, viz. declamatory replies to certain of his critic's speeches.

The character of the witticism with which Messala pointed his judgment is familiar. It gives generously with one hand while it takes away mischievously or maliciously with the other. Probably some example of a similar kind will occur to every reader. Only recently I found a popular novelist praised for "her sublime, suburban style "; but English literature affords some more classical examples. In Henry the Fourth, part one, the scene may be recalled where the Welshman, Owen Glendower, with complacent satisfaction in his English

[1] Seneca, Suas. VI 27. [2] Controv, I, Praef. 16.
[3] Controv. II 4, 9.

eloquence, proclaims bombastically the portents observed at his nativity.   Hotspur impatient at length breaks in:

> I think there is no man speaks better Welsh.
> I'll to dinner.

Chaucer too in his description of the Prioresse may be suspected of a gentle malice:

> And Frensh she spak ful faire and fetisly,
> After the scole of Strattford atte Bowe,
> For Frensh of Paris was to her unknowe.

But reverting to Latin once more, another example very similar to Messala's reply is found in Seneca's satire on the death of Claudius.   He describes the difficulty that was found in discovering an advocate to speak for the prince before Aeacus. At length one P. Petronius, an old companion presented himself—*Claudiana lingua disertus,* "eloquent in the Claudian tongue", that is, a stammerer.

It was I suspect with satirical intention similar to these examples that Asinius praised the eloquence of Livy as *Patavinitas,* "purest Paduan".   The highest compliment that men of literary creed like Asinius or Messala could pay to any speaker or writer would have been to recognize that perfect mastery of native idiom which they called *Latinitas.*   In place of this, with malicious wit and provoking assonance, Pollio's judgment was simply *Patavinitas,* as if to say *lingua Patavina disertus*—in brevity surpassing, but in spirit and intention exactly paralleling Messala's *sua lingua disertus.*   As for the time or occasion of its utterance we know no more than before, but our interpretation may justify a surmise: it savors of publicity, and its edge would have lost much of its keenness in any other form than immediate oral comment.   It suggests scenery and a situation, of which, like the point of an epigram, it is the conclusion.

The judgment of Asinius was contained in the one word *Patavinitas.*   For his time and coterie it required no explanation.   It was passed on as the bare verdict of the literary censor of the Augustan age to the time of Quintilian.[1]   By

---

[1] The use of the present tense (reprehendit, putat) would indicate that Quintilian drew from a literary source and not from oral tradition or report.   One would think naturally of some collection of clever sayings (urbane dicta) or biographical reminiscences.

him it was taken up merely as an illustration of extravagant sensibility, and so far as we can see without recognition of its satirical point. As for what may have lain behind it of real or imagined divergence from the subtle standards of Roman *urbanitas* it is idle for us to speculate. Quintilian did not know, and Pollio himself might have found it no easier to make specific defence of his judgment than Cicero does to define the elusive quality of urban speech. *Qui est, inquit Brutus, iste tandem urbanitatis color? Nescio, inquam: tantum esse quendam scio.*[1] The reproach of provincialism is of course common enough at all times. The chapter of the Brutus just cited deals with it at some length. Elsewhere in the same work Cicero refers to two brothers *oppidano quodam genere dicendi*, who nevertheless attained to some distinction. Of the same character is Seneca's designation of a certain Catius Crispus as *municipalis orator* or *declamator*. We cannot therefore pass beyond the obvious fact that Asinius called the style or speech of Livy provincial. But, in place of a prosaic or matter of fact statement of this impression, the judgment was conveyed, in accordance with the character of the critic, in a single word of pungent wit.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

[1] Brutus 171.

V.—NIGIDIUS GRAMMATICUS; CASUS INTER-ROGANDI.

A. Sulpicius Apollinaris ap. Gell. 20. 6. 7–8:

Dubium porro non est quin eodem haec omnia casu dicantur: <'*nostri nosmet paenitet*',> '*nostri* oblitus est'. '*nostri* misertus est', quo dicitur '*mei* <me> paenitet', '*mei* misertus est', '*mei* oblitus est'. '*Mei*' autem casus *interrogandi* est quem 'genetivum' grammatici vocant, et ab eo declinatur quod est 'ego' . . . . Sic namque Plautus declinavit in Pseudolo (5–6):

> duorum labori ego hominum parsissem lubens:
> mei te rogandi et [tui] tis respondendi mihi.

'*mei*' . . hoc in loco . . ab eo quod est 'ego' . . . 'patrem *mei*' pro 'patrem meum', quo Graeci modo τὸν πατέρα μου dicunt, inusitate quidem, sed recte profecto loqui ratione dicas, qua Plautus dixit 'labori *mei*' pro 'labori meo'. For OLat. *me = mei* see AJP. 35. 253.

Note: It will be supposed in the sequel that Sulpicius followed Nigidius or a source of Nigidius.

A'. Nonius (501. 13) sub lemmate *genetivus* pro dativo cites the same lines, but 7 as follows:

> me interrogandi et tui respondendi mihi.

Notes: Correct *me* to *mi* or *mei*; and let us suppose that Nonius had before him the text of Nigidius or of a predecessor of Nigidius.

B. The *ī/ei* rule in Nigidius (cf. for Lucilius AJP. 33. 313) is found in Gell. 13. 26. 4:

'huius amici' . . ' huius magni ' . . 'hii magnii' 'hii amicii' casu multitudinis recto.

B'. (*ii* not *ei*), ap. Gell. 19. 14. 8:

Graecos non tantae inscitiae arcesso, qui ου [= ū] ex ο et υ scripserunt. <quantae> qui *ei* ex *e* et *i*; illud enim inopia fecerunt, hoc nulla re subacti.

C. Distinction of genitive and dative in the first declension. Nigidius ap. Gell. 13. 26. 4: huius *terrai* . . . huic *terrae*.

C'. Ibid.:

'*mi*' qui scribit in casu *interrogandi*, velut cum dicemus '*mi* studiosus', per *i* unum scribat, non per *e*; at cum *mei*, tum per *e* et *i* scribendum est quia dandi casus est.

D. Conflict of genitive and locative in ī, ibid. 13. 26. 1:

deinde voculatio qui poterit servari, si non sciemus in nominibus, ut Valeri, utrum *interrogandi* sint an *vocandi*? Nam *interrogandi* se-

cunda syllaba superiore tonost quam prima, deinde novissima dicitur [= Valéri] ; at in casu *vocandi* summo tonost prima, deinde gradatim descendunt [= Váleri].

E.   On the Future-Perfect, ibid., 17. 7. 8 :

si dividas separesque duo verba haec '*subruptum*' et '*erit*', ut sic audias *subruptum <erit>* tamquam *certamen erit* aut *sacrificium erit* tum videbitur . . in post futurum loqui, si vero copulate permixteque dictum intellegas . . . tum hoc verbo non minus praeteritum tempus ostenditur quam futurum.

E'.   Ibid., §4, Gellius comments as follows :

sed anguste perquam et obscure disserit, ut signa rerum ponere videas ad subsidia magis memoriae suae quam ad legentium disciplinam.

F.   Etymology by Symbolic Gesture, ibid., X. 4. 4 :

'*vos*' cum dicimus, motu quodam oris conveniente cum ipsius verbi demonstratione utimur et labeas sensim primores emovemus ac spiritum atque animam porro versus et ad eos quibuscum sermocinamur, intendimus.

G.   Ibid., 17. 13. 11 : quod quia longioris dissertationis poterit cui otium est reperire hoc in P. Nigidii commentariis.

Note : Here Nigidius may have been drawn on, though not verbally cited.

H.   Recent articles on *i/ei* in Lucilius :

Skutsch in Glotta 1. 309; Sommer in Hermes 44, 70 sq.; Kent in AJP. 32, 272-293; 34, 315-321; Fay, ibid., 33, 311-316; 34, 497-499.

What was the source of the name *casus interrogandi* as used by Sulpicius Apollinaris, perhaps after a Nigidian source, in extract A; and in extracts C' and D by Nigidius himself?

I will confess to having first supposed that in D Nigidius was distinguishing between a vocative as used in far-off calling (*casus vocandi*) and as used in dialogue, the case of near-by dialogue (*casus interrogandi*). If *Váleri* was a calling case, the accent implies the retention, or renewal, in Latin, of the original recessive accentuation of vocatives. But if the *casus interrogandi* began thus as a designation of the interlocutory vocative, some blunder comparable with Nonius' confusion, in his 9th book, of gen. pl. *deum* with acc. sg. *deum*, must be assumed. And why should one grammarian hesitate to assume that another blundered?

But in A and in C' the example given for the *casus interrogandi* was, as Nigidius spelled it, *mi* (i. e. monosyllabic *mei*), equal to Skr. *me* (gen. and dat.), an equation these extracts should go far to raise beyond doubt. The earliest literary example adduced (in A and A') is Plautine *mei te ro-*

gandi, in which *mei* is regarded as a substitute for *meo* (sc. labori). But Nonius read *me interrogandi*, which may have been, as *me<i>*, the genuine original. If Plautus actually wrote *mei te rogandi* still *mei interrogandi*, whether a scholar's or actor's correction, is as likely to have been made prior to Nigidius as prior to Nonius. As a difficult passage the line was likely to have been excerpted for comment in the grammatical lists before Varro or his contemporary Nigidius. In such a list, the brief explanation may have run something like the following: '*mei*' ut hic usurpatur, in casu [short for in eodem casu ac] '*interrogandi*' est, non in casu *dandi*. Now let us suppose our grammarian to have made a list of *mei* groups including the examples A and C', all rubricated sub lemmate *mei interrogandi*: the final genesis of a category called the *casus interrogandi* would be comparable with that nomenclature of the Hindu grammarians whereby the arbitrary examples *tatpuruṣa-* and *bāhuvrīhi-* were chosen to designate large groups of compounds in which their own place was quite obscure. In our case *mei* would naturally carry with it *nostri vestri tui sui* which were not felt as genitives at large, but played a quite restricted rôle.

Beyond this restricted group, the term *casus interrogandi* is applied only to gen. *Valérī*, to distinguish it from voc. *Váleri*, whereas in its (as I suppose) original use, the term *casus interrogandi* was applied to the form *mei* (*mī*) to distinguish the genitive use from the *casus dandi*. In both cases, the term distinguished a genitive from some competing function of a form in -*ī* (-*ei*), and in the word *mī* the genitive competed not only with the dative but with a locative. Thus in *mi amice* the three conceptions were (1) φίλε μου, (2) ἐμοὶ φίλε, (3) *mi* (like *care*) *amice*. If we replace *mi amice* by *mi Valeri* the latter looked to be either a vocative or a genitive, so that we may realize how easy was the extension of the description *casus interrogandi* from *mi* to *Valeri*. It was probably due to instances like *mi Valeri, mi fili* (*fili mi*, cf. Plautus *Men.*, 182, anime mei, Menaechme) that *mi* was felt to be a masculine only—as compared with ὦ γύναι μοι (cf. A).[1]

So far as Nigidius' rules for the distribution of -*ī* in the

---

[1] There were no circumstances under which vocatival *ti* and *si* (pace Lindsay, Lat. Lang. 423) could be freely used.

paradigms go, he has set up a better system of mnemonics
(cf. E′) than Lucilius (cf. AJP. 33. 313), for he allocates *ī* to
the genitive and *ei* (or *e*, in *terrae*) to the dative singular, but
ii to the plural. His differentiation of gen. *mi* from dative
mei does not, with Skutsch, prove that, in the only half-pre-
served rule of Lucilius, dat. *furei* was made to differ by its *e*
from the genitive of the proper name, *Furi*. The obvious truth
is, as both Skutsch and I failed to see, that Lucilius started
out with the two indeterminate examples *mendaci* and *furi*;
and if we had his example completely we should probably find
that, as he used *furei* to illustrate the correct dative orthogra-
phy, so for the ablative he would have used *mendaci*. Som-
mer's interesting example of "sympathetic" orthography in
Greek, viz. λῑμός, as falsely derived from λείπω, is thoroughly
in keeping with my suggestion (AJP. 33. 313) that ablv. *luci*
(I should have used *mendaci*) "lacked" the *ī* because the ab-
lative was a case of "lack" (separation). But so far as our
Latin rules go, the term "mnemonics" seems to suit the lan-
guage of the rule better than a reference to "sympathetic"
orthography, though these terms are of course not mutually
exclusive; mnemonics may be sympathetic.

Mention may further be made that the form *temperi* ' bei Zei-
ten, betimes' would have been spelled by Lucilius with -*ī*,
though we now know it to be a dative (zur <rechten> zeit),
but in point of use a temporal locative, as χαμ-αί is a localis
from a dative. Both examples confirm Bartholomae's view
that IE. -*ai* was a dative-locative ending.

The Nigidius citations not bearing on the *i/ii/ei* question,
nor on the term *casus interrogandi*, have been included to show
how this grammarian made, by way of mnemonics, some un-
tenable and even fictitious distinctions. As regards his explan-
ation of *vos* as an oral gesture (F), whether fictitious or no,
it has a curious plausibility. But it is quoted here only to
record evidence of interest in the history of Etymology (cited
by Müller, in his de Veterum studiis etymologicis I, 55², with
Greek antecedents).

EDWIN W. FAY.

AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache von Dr. RAPHAEL KÜHNER, Band I, Elementar-, Formen- und Wortlehre, Neubearbeitet von Dr. Fr. HOLZWEISSIG, pp. XVI–1127, Band II, Satzlehre, von Dr. CARL STEGMANN, T. 1 pp. XII–828, T. 2 VIII–738, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, Hannover, 1912–1914. I. 24 M. brosch., 26 geb., II¹, 18 M. brosch., 20 M. geb., II², 16.50 M. brosch., 18.50 geb.

A new edition of this important work is most welcome. The publishers in their announcement refer to it as "die 2. vollständig neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage". That it lives up to one part of the title, "erweiterte", may be seen from the fact that Vol. I has been enlarged from 767 pages to 1143, Vol. II, 1 from 639 to 840 and II, 2 from 551 to 746, a total of 2729 pages, an increase of 772 pages, 376 on Forms, 396 on Syntax.

When a work has assumed such encyclopedic proportions as those indicated above, a detailed review would manifestly lead far afield. Mindful, therefore, of the limitations of time and space, and owing to the fact that the reviewer had already forwarded to the Editor an extensive list of corrections and additions to the first part [1] of Vol. II of which due acknowl-

---

[1] A few additional notes may here be added: p. 88 *Pluralis Modestiae*: the "Editorial We" is also found in Lucil. 15, 51, 386, 1024, Lucr. 4. 383, 643, 742, 1037, Varro L. L. 8. 26; 9. 38; 67 etc., Auct. Her. 1. 18. P. 256 "*macti* nur Plin. N. H. 2. 54" (cited in I, p. 547 as "Plin. 2, c. 9"! However, the Editor adds: "*macte* mit der Var. *macti*"). The form should be *macte*; cf. Schmalz Antib. *s. v*, and Wünsch, Rhein. Mus. 69 (1914) p. 127 f. P. 316 *Intentus* "seit Livius c. dat." (as in the 1st. ed.), but cf. Sall. Iug. 76. 2: 89. 3: 94. 5. It is also found in Verg. A. 7. 380. P. 338 *Incumbere*, with *ad*, also Cic. Cat. 4. 4, Pomp. 19, ad Q. Fr. 1. 1. 11, ad Att. 1. 19. 4: 2. 16. 3; with *in*, also: Fam. 10. 1. 2; 5. 2; 14. 2; Att. 3. 15. 3; 23. 5: 5. 13. 3: XV. 25; Q. Fr. 3. 8. 6; cf. further Lease, A. J. P., XXVIII, p. 50. P. 630 *et ipse*: also found in Lucr. 6. 7, Tib. 1. 9. 39; 10. 23, Prop. 3. 24. 11: 4. 9. 4, Ovid Met. 6. 3, Her. 21. 227, A. A. 2. 213, Rem. Am. 615. P. 686 add: *maius videri* Ovid Met. 7. 639 (cf. Pont. 1. 5. 17 maior scribere). P. 692 *Cano* c. Acc. et inf. but one passage cited; cf. also Liv. 1. 7. 10: 2. 42. 10: 5. 15. 4: 7, 6. 3: 30. 28. 2; 5: 39. 46. 4. P. 811. 3 *Forsan*: to the passages cited in A. J. P. XXVIII. p. 45 add: Sil. 6. 507: 15, 375; 393: 16. 517, Val. Fl. 3. 518, Stat. Th. 1. 428; 472: 10, 702, Silv. 1. 36. 2: 2. 3. 63; 6. 101: 3. 4. 10: 5. 2. 153; 3. 69; 185. Note the frequency with which this form was used by Sen. Trag., Stat., and Mart., each using it ten times. P. 826 *nec non et*: cf. also Lease, A. J. P. XXX, p. 302 f. and add: Stat. Ach. 2. 249; Auson.

edgement had been made (cf. II², p. IV and 632 f.), he has taken the second part, II, 2, as his special province and has restricted himself to a few selected portions in this wide domain.

It may be prefaced in a general way that Kühner's Latin Grammar was a good book and that the editors have made it better. By bringing its great wealth of information [1] into accord with the results of recent investigations (since 1878) the editors have rendered the cause of classical scholarship a valuable service. The revised edition with its 1586 pages devoted to Syntax unquestionably contains the most exhaustive discussion that we now have of the *raison d' être* of the principal usages of Latin Syntax, of their manifold ramifications, their incipient stages [2] and later development down to the time of Tacitus. The editor has further increased our obligations by the extensive additions he has made to the lists of citations, thus placing at our disposal a more complete record, particularly in the classical realm, than is to be found in any other work. When an editor has given us so much and so much that is good, criticisms seem decidedly ungracious. But the fact remains and cannot be disregarded that the demands of modern scholarship are such that the task of covering with thoroughness and completeness so extensive a field [3] is far too

---

103, c. 4 (P.), Prud. Ps. 559, S. 1. 50: Per. 1. 10: 5. 485: 10. 1024: 14. 5 Note also that on p. 796, "*ne* konfirm." is also found in Cic. Att, 7. 4. 3 ne ego; 14, 14. 5 ne nos; 15. 11. 3 ne multa; Fam. 7. 30. 1 ne tu, and on p. 256 read Hor. S. 1. 2. 31; p. 319, c read C. 3. 8. 19; p. 679, ftn. 1 read Lease Archiv XI, and p. 792, line 9 read Liv. 2. 33. 8. It may also be added that the "Gen. Comparationis", cited in II. 1, p. 469, for Vitr. 1. 5. 4 is extremely doubtful; see Morgan, Addresses and Essays, p. 200.

[1] The numbering of the main sections in the old edition has in general been preserved in the new, except that one, § 248 Prosarythmus und Klauselgesetz, has been added.

[2] Those, however, of the Moods and Tenses and the Cases, preceded by an extended discussion of the fundamental principles underlying the origin of each and followed by a detailed account of their frequency of usage, have been treated with greater fullness by Bennett in his two volumes on the Syntax of Early Latin (1912–1914).

[3] The larger the field, the greater the liability to errors, both of omission and commission The editor himself, by the addition of over five pages of corrections to II, 1. (cf. II, 2, pp. 632 f.) bears witness to this fact. Further evidence is presented, p. 80 *supra*. The latest texts were in general used, but Lachmann's Lucilius (1876) was used in II, 1, instead of Marx's (1904). So also on pp. 113 and 462 the references should be to Vahlen² Sc. 355, and Sc. 308. On p. 209, 2a account was not taken of the reading of Meusel, B. C. 3. 55. 1, and of the readings of the latest texts of Livy in II, 1, p. 2, Anm., II, 2 pp. 20, 121, 147, 151, 154, l. 12, 287, l. 8, 507, 513, 562. Some omissions are also to be found in the references to the latest treatment of certain subjects, as e. g. II, 1, p. 11, F. G. Moore, Trans. Am. Phil. Assn., 1903, p. 9; p. 307, F. Solmsen, Zur Gesch. des Dativs, Z. V. Spr., XLIV, pp. 61-223, Fay,

6

great for one man to undertake. For him there awaits the
eulogy of Phaethon. It need hardly be said, therefore, that
the term, 'vollständig' can no more be applied with accuracy
to the lists of citations in the second edition than it could to
those in the first.[1] One defect, and one easily remedied, is the
fact that a distinction was not always made between lists that
are complete and those that are not, with the result that an
entirely erroneous impression is often made. Inasmuch as
one frequently finds prefixed to a list " wie " or " z. B.", and such
words appended as " u. oft ", " u. sonst ", " u. a ", etc., occa-
sionally complete statistics given (e. g. II, 1, p. 711, II, 2, pp.
57, 257, 277, 343, 356, etc.), or a footnote reference indicating
where a complete list can be found, the impression is inevi-
tably made that where such expressions are not used the lists
given are complete. Bennett's two volumes on the Syntax of
Early Latin (a third is promised) show how incomplete are

Class. Quart. V (1911), p. 85 f., Glotta, II, pp. 169–181. Gustafson, De
Dativo Latino, 1904; p. 496, ftn. 3: Wölfflin, Archiv XII, p. 384, Pfister,
Rhein. Mus. 67 (1912), pp. 195–208; p. 664 H, V. Canter, The Infinitive
Constructions in Livy, 1906; p. 720, A. R. Anderson, The Exclamatory
Infin., Class. Rev. IX (1904), p. 60; II 2, p. 29 *I nunc*, Lease, A. J. P.
XIX, p. 59 f.; p. 35. 3 Archiv XV, p. 165; p. 372, ftn. 1, Glotta, I,
p. 245, Archiv V, p. 149 and *id.* ftn. 3: Archiv V, p. 567, Skutsch, Bphw.,
1900, p. 469; p. 391, Archiv XIII, p. 204; p. 451, Steele, Trans. Am.
Phil. Assn., 1902, p. 72; p. 468, b Schmalz, Glotta, V (1913), p. 270; p.
514 *Numne*, Lease, A. J. P. XX, p. 62; p. 624 Anm. 1, Lease to Livy²,
Intr. § 23. Postgate, Class. Rev. 20, p. 461, Brodribb, ib. 24, p. 13. and 25,
p. 104, H. Bornecque, Les Clausules métr. Lat. 1907. Shipley, Cl. Phil,
VI (1910), p. 410 f. See further, p. 85 *infra*.
  Note also the following typographical errors: II, 2, p. 21, read Liv.
21. 41. 13; p. 79, l. 15 Trasumennum; p. 89 ftn. 1 Die obige, etc.; p.
207, Liv. 21. 35. 2 concursabant: p. 209 Liv. 34. 17. 8 (p. 287, Liv. 21.
6.3 = ?); p. 368, end, erumpamus; p. 374, Liv. 22. 39. 10: pp. 385 and
445 Anm. 1, Schmalz Synt.⁴; p. 441 Cic. Fam. 13. 71 tamen, etsi; p.
444, Anm. 3, l. 2 tametsi; (p. 545, Liv. 22. 1. 8 = ?) ; p. 573, ftn. 1, Lind-
say; p. 641, Tenney Frank; p. 645, Lease, neque: the; p. 687 dico ut, II,
221 f.; p. 710 ob, c. acc., 530 ff.. and in II, 1, p. 93, Anm. 1 read Bennett;
p. 712, l. 4, Anm. 23. Another feature that might have received greater
attention is the variations of the poetical from the prose usage. Wet-
more's Lexica to Vergil and to Catullus (neither of which was used)
could have been consulted with profit. One also misses from the list
of works used (II, 2, p. 638 f.) mention of Lodge's Lexicon Plautinum
(A–H). Note also, p. 720 quaeso *ut*, II, p. 217d, and p. 732 teneo, end,
764b.
  [1] The editor himself has taken occasion to point out (Vorwort, p. IV)
the impropriety in the use of this word in referring to the first edition.
After quoting Landgraf's reference to it as one in which the classical
usage was "vollständig verzeichnet", and remarking that the treatises
of Lebreton and others have shown how incomplete its lists were, he
adds that he himself has taken pains to make them more complete
("vielfache Ergänzungen und reicheres Material zu geben"). The
character of the supplementary lists (II, 2, p. 632 f.) is additional evi-
dence that the editor has made an effort to supply its deficiencies in
this respect.

the citations in this field. Even in the classical realm[1]
("durchaus im Vordergrunde") the collections which the
reviewer had on hand show that in the two parts of Vol. II
there is a similar lack of completeness, particularly for the
usage of Cicero (rhetorical and epistolary works), of Ovid,
and of Livy. Of course, completeness of citation for every
usage is from the nature of the case neither possible nor
desirable. But there can be no doubt that the value of the
book would have been greatly increased, if in every instance
lists that were merely illustrative had been clearly indicated.
A few syntactical details have been selected for comment—
"*difficilius est exitum quam principium invenire*".

P. 14, 7 -*que* "an einsilbige Wörtchen": should be "an ein-
silbige Partikeln", as *idque, meque, teque, reque,* etc. are of
not infrequent occurrence. Passages from Cicero showing
how *aque* was avoided (as Fam. 2. 16. 1 a meque), *abque* (as
Tusc. 5. 94 ab iisque), adque (as Fin. 3. 72 ad easque), *obque*
(as Att. 6. 2. 9 ob eamque) etc. might well have been noted.

P. 15 *Atque* "selten vor Konsonanten", as in the first edi-
tion: the consonant, the author, his period, should all be taken
into consideration; e. g. in Sallust *atque* is used before con-
sonants more often (184 times) than *ac* (131), and in every
writer *atque* before gutturals is more common than *ac*: for
details see Lease, Stud. in Honor of Gildersleeve, p. 416 f. and
Class. Phil. III (1908), p. 304.

P. 35. 3 *Que . . . que*: with substantives also found in Lucil.
37, 1033, 1229, 1290, Hor. A. P. 199, 214 (Correct also Schmalz
Synt.⁴, p. 498).

P. 38 *Nec* vor Vokalen: 7 cited for Vergil; add A. 2. 491;
11. 382; 801; 12. 207, before *h*: G. 3. 216, A. 2. 584; 12. 630.
In Vergil, *nec* before vowel = 14, before cons. = 435.

P. 98 *Tamen*, with concessive particle omitted: Ovid's
usage is so striking it ought to have been noted: he uses it
almost 7 times (478) as often as Verg. (38), Hor. (25), and
Tib. (6) combined. Ovid also uses *Et tamen* 16 times, Vergil
once (A. 3. 478).

P. 113 *Namque*: before a consonant is also found in Naev.

---

[1] Though the author disclaims any intention of writing an Historical
Grammar, the fact remains that in many instances he has treated sub-
jects in this manner. Elimination of such matter (we have Schmalz),
curtailment of that devoted to the Syntax of Early Latin (we have
Bennett), and concentration upon the Syntax of the Classical period,
(always remaining as the chief center of our studies) together with a full
and complete treatment of the usage of the writers of this period, both
in prose and in poetry, would have satisfied a long felt want. Such a
book is still a great desideratum. As we are soon to have three
volumes on the Syntax of Early Latin, let us hope that these are but
the precursor of three volumes on the Syntax of Classical Latin, to be
followed (the dawn of the syntactical millennium) by three volumes on
the Later Development of Latin Syntax.

Trg. 41 n. ludere (Enn. tr. 370=Sc. 355 (V²)), Caecil. 278.
"An zweiter Stelle": 5 are cited in Verg. followed by "u. ö"!
There are only two more (A. 10. 401, 815). For A. 3, 379
read 8. 497.

P. 148 *Proinde*: with an imperative: also Livy 2. 12. 10: 3.
45. 7: 21. 18. 12. Note its use in Cic. Att. 2. 9. 2 proinde isti
licet faciant; with a fut. ind. in 3. 13. 1, Plin. min. 9. 29. 2;
with a fut. inf. Val. Max. 4. 1. 10, Iust. 31. 7. 6; with a pres.
ind. Plin. Min. 6. 12. 5: 7. 1. 2; 17. 14; 27. 15. Note also p.
adnitendum est, 2. 9. 2 and p. quid cessatis? 6. 20. 10. (but one
passage was cited in Plin. Min.). "Curt." is mentioned, but
no passages cited: with pres. ind. 4. 15. 8: 9. 3. 5: 10. 9. 3: 6.
3. 11 omittenda sunt, and 3. 5. 13; 5. 9. 8 pres. subj. With
the imperat. subj.: none cited in Livy: cf. 1. 9. 4; 16. 7; 39,
3: 6. 39. 11: 21. 22. 6; 30. 11: 25. 38. 21: 26. 22. 7: 28. 32. 12.

Pp. 256–267 and 372 f.: the treatment of the particles *quin,
quominus, dum, donec,* and *quoad* is far from being complete.[1]

P. 294 *Ut qui* "c. coni. mit Ausnahme von Tac. G. 22. 1":
but there is a nest of indicatives in Ovid Ibis 371 f. The ind.
is also found in Val. Max. 2. 7. 9: 5. 4. 1, and Apul. De Plat.
2. 22. (but in Apol. 70. the subj.) Note that Schmalz Synt.⁴
p. 535 refers to *utpote qui* with the indic. in Apul. Ascl. 2.
This example, however, is extremely doubtful, as the verb is
found in Or. *Obl.,* and especially in view of the fact that in
Ascl. 6, 8, 75 and 37 the subj. is used with this combination.

P. 302, 4 *priusquam ut*: also found in Plaut. Most. 867,
Ter. Hec. 262, Cic. Lig. 34, Att. 8, 11 D, 5, Fam. 13. 1. 6, Livy
26. 26. 7: 35. 11. 5: 40. 47. 5.

P. 385 *non quin*: also found in Cic. Fam. 13. 16. 3: 16. 24.
1, Q. Fr. 1. 1. 15, Att. 8. 11 D, 7: 10. 7. 1: 12. 47. 2, De Or. 2.
295, Or. 227, Livy 2. 15. 2: 32. 32. 6 (Cf. *quin non*: Plaut.
Merc. 322, Most. 599. Cic. Att. 5. 11. 6: 8. 11 D. 3, Cels. 109.
17 (D.).

P. 443 *Licet* with impf. subj.: to the passages cited in A. J.
P. XXI (1901), p. 454 add: Varro L. L. 7. 2; Stat. Silv. 5.
123, Plac. Stat. Th. 1. 143: 4. 515: 6. 461: 10. 385; 420: 11.
473; with plpf. subj.: Th. 2. 453: 3. 118. *Licebit* (concess.):
Ovid not cited; cf. Met. 2. 58: 13. 862; Trist. 5. 14. 3 all with
tamen added, and Am. 2. 11. 53, Her. 20. 71, Met. 8. 755; 14.
355, Pont. 3. 4. 33 all without *tamen.* In Lucan, also found in
8. 629. *Licet* with a participle, also: Sen. Contr. 1. 5. 5, Apul.
Flor. 35. 15 (H.), and with abl. abs.: Ovid Fast. 4. 779, Mart.
1. 7. 1.

P. 597 The use of *-que* at the end of a clausula: cf. Lease,
A. J. P. XXX (1909), p. 307.

---

[1] E. g. *dum* with pres. ind.: 7 are cited for Cicero's Letters, but there
are 27 (8 also omitted in Rhet.) ; *donec*: 8 cited for Livy, but there are
109; *quoad,* 1 cited for Livy, but there are 25, etc.

P. 624 Anm. 1, "Heroische Klauseln von Cicero im allge-
meinen gemieden": as no mention is made of the usage of
other writers and of Cicero except in the Speeches, no atten-
tion given to the longer (4–6 ft.) clausula and to the use of
the last half of the pentameter, the following details [1] are sup-
plied. For the sake of clearness and brevity the tabular form
of presentation has been adopted, and as a unit of measure
the Teubner page has been used.

Authors.	2 ft.	3 ft.	4 ft.	5 ft.	6 ft.	Pentameter.	Total.	Pages.	Relative Frequency.
Cicero, Rhet.....	10	6	3	3	2	1	25	569	1 in 22.4 pages.
Speeches.	77	30	—	—	—	—	107	1608	1 in 15 pages.
Phil.....	19	1	1	1	0	1	23	1001	1 in 43.5 pages.
Ad Att..	31	8	6	6	0	1	52	560	1 in 10.8 pages.
Ad Fam.	17	0	0	0	0	5	22	557	1 in 25.3 pages.
Caesar..........	58	20	16	7	2	7	110	340	1 in 3.1 pages.
Nepos	19	9	2	2	3	3	38	113	1 in 3 pages.
Sallust..........	46	13	5	0	1	5	70	121	1 in 1.7 pages.
Livy, Bk. I	18	13	6	3	1	3	44	67	1 in 1.5 pages.
Bk. XXI..	19	12	3	3	0	2	39	59	1 in 1.5 pages.
Bk. XXII.	17	12	3	0	3	5	40	64	1 in 1.6 pages.
Bk. XL. ..	13	4	1	2	0	2	22	55	1 in 2.5 pages.
Bk. XLV .	5	2	1	1	0	0	9	50	1 in 5.5 pages.
Seneca Rhet.....	24	15	7	4	2	6	58	525	1 in 9.1 pages.
Total	373	145	54	32	14	41	659	5689	1 in 8.6 pages.

NOTES.

1. In Cicero's complete works the heroic clausula was used
221 times (Rhet. 24, Sp. 107, Phil. 22, Lett. 68) in 4295 pages;
rate, 1 in 18.7 pp. He avoids this clausula with greater regu-
larity in his philos. works, and uses it with greater freedom in
writing to his friend Atticus than to his other correspondents.
In his youthful production, De Inv., he used these forms more
freely, 1 in 15 pp., than in the De Or., 1 in 22.3 pp. The
rhetorician Seneca felt no such reluctance to the use of these
cadences.

2. Livy's usage stands forth conspicuously in his fondness
for these clausulae. In his latest book, however, the contrast
between his atttitude and that of Cicero is not so marked:
Bk. I., in 1.5 pp., Bk. XLV, 1 in 5.5 pp.

3. Sallust's extensive usage (Cat., Iug.) of this clausula is
only another point of resemblance between his style and that

[1] For the usage of Cicero in his Speeches cf. Zielinski, Phil. Supl. IX,
p. 751. His tables do not show Cicero's use of 4–6 hexameter feet, or
of the pentameter cadence.

of Livy.   See further Lease, Livy², §§ 47–49.   Cf. also note 5 *infra*.

4.   The attitude of Nepos and that of Caesar¹ to the use of these clausulae is practically the same.

5.   The pentameter clausula was most frequently used by Livy and Sallust, least frequently by Cicero and Sen. rhet.

6.   A complete hexameter verse was used as a clausula twice by Cicero and twice by Caesar (cf. ftn.); by Nepos 3 times (14. 4. 2: 23. 7. 1; 10. 3), Sall. once (Cat. 40. 3), by Livy 4 (1. 28. 4: 22. 14. 6; 24. 12; 33. 4; also 21. 49. 3 spondaic), by Sen. rhet. twice (Contr. 5 exc. (p. 279 K.), 9 exc. 2 (p. 451 K.).   It may be added also that Livy in 22. 50. 10 has at the beginning of a sentence an hexameter verse and a half; in the middle, an hexameter in 21. 9. 3; 35. 12; 49. 11; so Sall. C. 19. 5; J. 5. 1, and Cic. Acad. 2. 122.   More remarkable is the use of a complete Elegiac distich (complexi . . . acies) in Cic., De Or. 3. 20.

In conclusion it is to be remarked that there can be no doubt that in the new edition "*plura nitent*" and that it is worthy of a prominent place in the working library of every student of the Latin language and of its syntactical problems.

EMORY B. LEASE.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

¹In Cicero, 6 ft. = 2 (Inv. 1. 109, P. O. 133); 5 ft. = 10 (Inv. 1. 56. De Or. 2. 314, Top. 73, Att. 1. 18. 8; 26. 2: 3. 15. 5: 7. 12. 4: 9. 13. 4: 12. 40. 6, Acad. 2. 80); 4 ft. = 9 (De Or. 2. 18; 109; Att. 1. 1. 1; 8. 12 B. 1; 9. 18. 1: 10. 18. 2: 11. 10. 1: 17a, 1, Off. 3. 69).   In Caesar, 6 ft. = 2 (B. C. 1. 46. 1: 58. 2 (B. G. 5. 57. 3 Meusel)); 5 ft. = 7 (1. 40. 6: 2. 5. 5; 31. 3; 5. 57. 3: 7. 78. 2, B. C. 1. 28. 2: 3. 79. 6).   It may be added that from the point of view of the clausula there was little difference between the usage of the B. G. and the B. C.   The clausula of 5 ft. was also found in Nepos twice (7. 6. 5; 8. 3). 9 times in Livy (1. 15. 2; 22. 6; 55. 1: 21. 18. 5; 40. 10; 49. 9: 40. 5. 8; 32. 7: 45. 16. 2 and 1. 35. 5 spondaic), and 4 in Sen. rhet. (Contr. Pr. 2; 1. 1. 13: 10. 2. 12; 5. 14).

Antigonos Gonatas.   WILLIAM WOODTHORPE TARN.   Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1913.

It was a happy chance that Mr. Tarn's account of the ancient Balkan States was published when these kingdoms were the centre of interest in the modern world.   Our modern historians do not permit us to say that history repeats itself, but there are some remarkable coincidences in the two eras although they are separated by more than twenty centuries. The "balance of power" was fought for again and again on the battlefields of Europe and Asia.   The value of the supremacy of the seas was demonstrated in no uncertain way

when one of the kings entered upon an ambitious naval pro-
gramme. Enmities of long standing were forgotten and an *en-
tente* was formed to crush him. There was a tendency to
create neutral states, and to exempt sacred places from attack
and plunder. In the private and intellectual life of the people
there are many points of contact with modern civilization.
The movement towards reality appeared in every phase of
life, in literature, art, science and philosophy. Universities,
too, were organized, and in the disputations of the professors
we have something sadly akin to the modern doctor's disser-
tation.

The central figure in European civilization in the third cen-
tury was Antigonos Gonatas, and around this character Mr.
Tarn has woven the history of Greece and Macedon during
his sovereignty. Perhaps no period of Greek history is more
difficult to deal with because of the chaotic and contradictory
nature of the evidence for the early part of the third century,
and since the evidence for the later years of his reign has long
since been lost to us. In the earlier period the investigator
must be endowed with a critical faculty developed to the
highest degree; for the latter a vivid imagination to bridge
the gaps. In Mr. Tarn these qualities are apparently most
happily combined, and he has succeeded in reconstructing the
history of Antigonos' reign with a closer approximation to
truth than had hitherto been attained.

The opening chapters are devoted to an account of Antigo-
nos' teachers and the empire of Demetrios. The brief sketches
of Menedemos and Zeno and their systems of philosophy are
particularly good. In discussing the extent of Demetrios'
rule on land, the year 295/4 is taken as a starting point, since
in that year he recovered Athens. On the assumption that
the eponymos archon was the former democrat, Tarn follows
Ferguson in believing that a coalition government with mod-
erates from both parties was constituted. But Olympiodoros
is not an uncommon name and there is no proof of identity.
Unless Stratokles has reformed, any coalition government
with him as a member would be largely Stratokles. After his
death which seems to have come somewhere between 295 and
293, there was a better chance for moderate policies to pre-
vail, and it was then that Phaidros came to the helm and guided
the state through the δύσκολοι καιροί to a reestablished democ-
racy. The civic troubles are reflected in the abandonment for
a time of the usual tribal rotation by which the secretaries
were appointed. The establishment of the new cycle in 291/0
is proof that a certain measure of democracy was granted by
Demetrios on the advice of Phaidros.

The chronological problems in Greek history between 290
and 260 B. C. have been a favorite battleground for the histo-

rians in recent years. The debate centres about the secretary-cycle, and its relative merits as compared with the evidence gathered from literary sources. Tarn has far outstripped his predecessors in dealing with the problem, and he has proved beyond a doubt that the cycle and literary evidence can only be reconciled by assuming a break in the former at some point between 294 and 290. Diokles must be dated in 288/7 B. C., and the revolt of Athens from Demetrios in 289/8. The weakness of Tarn's chronology for the succeeding years is due to his too faithful acceptance of Beloch's theories without sufficient examination; for by keeping Polyeuktos-Hieron in 275–273 B. C. he was compelled to assume unusual breaks in the cycle in 285–282 B. C. which could not be accounted for. If Tarn had allowed the cycle to continue without interruption from 291 to 262 he would have found the true solution of the chronological puzzle. We would outline the course of events as follows: Athens regained her independence in 289 and was free until 279. The formal abdication of Demetrios came in 286/5 when Antigonos assumed the title of King with, how-ever, only a few isolated towns as his actual kingdom. Athens probably remained loyal to Lysimachos until Seleucos offered them a more tempting alliance, and after Lysimachos mur-dered his son, they must have cast in their lot definitely with the ruler of Asia. While the kings were fighting for the throne of Macedon, Antigonos had to wait patiently as *ephed-ros* until he could engage the winner. Meanwhile he was free to attack Athens and the city was taken by stratagem in the early spring of 279 B. C. Death proved to be his best ally in Macedon, and then the Gallic invaders removed Keraunos who was slain in defending the kingdom he had so treacher-ously acquired. Antigonos now claimed his old inheritance, but probably only part of this unruly country was willing to acknowledge him. It made no material difference at the time for the second invasion of the Gauls in 278 put an end to any attempt to hold the northern lands against the invader. Anti-gonos withdrew to Asia and watched the course of events from there. In 276 his opportunity came, and striking a de-cisive blow at Lysimacheia he not only drove out the Gauls, but by the prestige of his victory, regained the throne of Macedon. There is no evidence that Athens had made any attempt to regain her independence during these three years. In fact it seems clear that Athens, under the moderate Phaid-ros as representative of the king, remained loyal from her ca-pitulation in 279 until the outbreak of the Chremonidean war. There was, of course, a nationalist party at all times, and subsidized by Egypt after 273 B. C. The Nationalists, however, never dared openly to defy Antigonos, although they did send an embassy to Pyrrhos after his wonderful successes in

Macedon inviting him to come over and help them throw off the chains of Antigonid rule. Pyrrhos refused their invitation and went on to Sparta. The Nationalist party promptly withdrew from view and nothing more is heard from them until the coalition of all Greece against Macedon in 267 when the Chremonidean war broke out. Athens held out longer than any of her Greek allies but Antigonos was too strong for her and in the fall of 262 the city yielded once more to the forces of the king.

If the history of the years 290–262 is built about the framework which we have briefly outlined, epigraphical and literary sources will be found to be in general accord. A new and independent examination of the dates of the Delphic archons is urgently needed in settling some of the problems preceding and during the Chremonidean war.

In dealing with the last years of Antigonos' reign, where inscriptional and literary evidence fail us almost completely, Tarn has succeeded in reconstructing the story with remarkable skill. Athens practically drops out of the reckoning and the chief interest of these years is found in the struggle between Macedon and Egypt for the supremacy of the sea, and in the breaking down of the Antigonid system of government in the dependent states. The former is a story of wonderful achievement in the face of apparently unsurmountable obstacles. The latter is a story of dismal failure. The tyrannies which he had established had to give way before the new spirit developing in Greece. The Achaean League, however, originated in a reaction against Macedon, and never got beyond that limitation. Moreover Greece was too much obsessed with the idea of the city state to permit the development of any sort of federal league. The importance of the reign of the Antigonids to civilization is thus expressed: From 277 to 168 Macedonia, under the Antigonids was the shield and bulwark of Greece, preserving Greek civilization from the possibility of being swamped by northern barbarism before its work was done, before it had yet taught Rome and through Rome the whole modern world; Macedonia and her kings stood in the gap till Rome was ready and able, with greater resources, to take up the work. Republican Rome herself, when her time came hardly and with many failures kept out the northerners; the Antigonids on the whole managed it with success. This is the real importance of the Antigonid dynasty in history. The world of classical scholarship owes to Mr. Tarn a debt of gratitude for having told this story so well.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

PRINCETON.

REPORTS.

I, pp. 1–41. O. Immisch. Der erste platonische Brief. (1) The purpose of the collection of Platonic letters, originally the sole purpose, was to supply the τρίτη πολιτεία (739 E). (2) Text of the first letter and discussion. It serves admirably to provide explanation and proof for what is said in the seventh letter about the founder of the tyranny. The position at the head of the collection is to be explained by the fact that the recipient was Dionysius I, not II. The letter was probably taken from the history of Timaeus. The collection was made in the first half of the 3d cent. B. C. The thirteenth letter also may have been borrowed from Timaeus, perhaps others also. The Hermias letter is certainly genuine, but was also probably taken from literary sources, perhaps the ἀπομνημονεύματα Πλάτωνος.

II, pp. 42–64. R. Hirzel, Οὐσία. The word developed from a concrete use in Attic popular and juristic language into the abstract term of the philosophers. Originally, it referred to property not only as regards the origin and purpose of one's possessions but especially as regards the substance and its entirety. The sense of 'being' and 'substance' is derived from the use of the word in the philosophical schools. Aristotle, who made it the chief of his categories, in discussing its different meanings, does not give its original meaning, although he often uses the original meaning in his political writings. In the Metaphysics he was concerned especially with the terminology of the philosophers. Plato and Aristotle used οὐσία for either 'being' or 'substance'; later it came to mean 'substance', and still later 'material'.

III, pp. 65–82. G. Kafka, Zu Theophrasts De sensu. Critical examination of some of the fragments of a work important for the history of psychology in antiquity. (1) § 9, ἴσων becomes intelligible, when we know that Empedokles referred tone-perception to a phenomenon of resonance. Thus we trace back to remote antiquity the root of one of the most modern theories of psychophysics, that the perceptive apparatus vibrates as a whole and not, as Helmholtz held, in its separate fibers. In § 20 καὶ γεῦσιν is a senseless interpolation; so also in § 44 συμβάλλεσθαι . . . γλῶτταν. In § 39, by reading λεπτότατον . . . ἀσύμμετρος as a parenthesis, the text at least re-

ceives logical connection. Other passages discussed are § 66; 71–72; 75; 84; 91.

IV, pp. 83–114. O. Schissel v. Fleschenberg, Die Technik des Bildeinsatzes. The fiction of describing a painting is often resorted to in sophistic writing to make a transition from introduction to the main part of the work; e. g. Kebes, Πίναξ c. 1–4; Petron. Sat. c. 81–88; Lukian. Toxaris, c. 5–8; Ps.-Lukian. Ἔρωτες, c. 6–17; Achill. Tat. I, 1–2; and the prooemium of Longus. The device becomes stereotyped. It was artistically and practically suited to realistic scenes. Arguing from the technical rules followed, the author tries to show that the part of Book XVI of Petronius now lost must have concluded with a separation of Encolpius from Giton; and also of Giton from Eumolpus.

V, pp. 115–124. R. Asmus, Zur Kritik und Erklärung von Julian Ep. 3* und 35. The third epistle was probably written in 359 A. D. The addressee is Salustius. Ep. 35 is addressed to an official who is friendly to philosophers, but who cannot be identical with the man who insulted the addressee of Ep. 3.

VI, pp. 124–148. H. Wingels (†), De ordine libellorum Lucianeorum. In very ancient times the works of Lucian were published either singly or in groups containing only a few of the writings. In the course of time (probably gradually) all these works were collected into a corpus. One such complete corpus is cod. Vat. 90 = Γ; part of another is cod. Harlelan. 4596 = E. Even in ancient times there were two different minor corpora of the dialogues. Cod. Vindobon. = B is derived entire from an ancient corpus of the whole of Lucian, which was made up of several corpora and single writings. The compilers of Γ and the corpus from which B was copied found the same corpuscula, which they arranged in different order.

Miscellen.

1, pp. 149–152. W. Schmid, Zu Virgils Catalepton. (1) Cat. II 2–5 is emended as follows:

> Iste, ἴστε, rhetor, usquequaque νοῦς totus
> Thucydides Britannus, Atticae 'φήβοις
> tau Gallicum, μιν et σφιν εὖ μάλα illisit,
> εἶτα omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.

In Cat. X 23, read pyxinumque pectinem. In XIV 9 f. read:

> Marmoreusque tibi atque ignicoloribus alis
> in morem posita stabit Amor pharetra.

2, pp. 152–155. Eb. Nestle, Beobachtungen zu den lateinischen Evangelien. (1) The cod. Bezae (D) alone, and only in the first gospel, more than 50 times translates ὁ δέ, etc. *qui autem.* In the other gospels it is regularly *at ille*, etc. This

fact points to different translators. (2) ait, dixit, inquit. From the use and non-use of *ait* in cod. D as a norm Nestle concludes that some of the peculiarities of usage in this MS may be due to local or provincial influences.

3, pp. 156–157. G. Landgraf, Lucilius Fr. 417 M 'si tricosus bovinatorque'. 'Bovinator' is a rustic word meaning a "loafer fit only for tending cattle". Tricosus is to be connected with *tricandi* found in Colum. 11, 1, 16 where the writer is following the Oeconomicus of Xenophon, probably in Cicero's translation. The corresponding Greek is προφάσεις εὑρίσκοντες. Those glosses are right which define *bovinator* by *tricosus*, and *bovinari* by *tricari*. Gell. 11, 7, 7 and Non., p. 79, 26 correctly give *bovinator* = *tergiversator* although the word is used in a more developed sense.

4, pp. 157–158. W. v. Voigt, Zu Cicero und Germanicus. (1) Cic. de legg. II, 9, 22 read: *avos* leto datos divos habento. (2) Germ. Arati Phen. 665 f. retain *Cancri*. In vs. 444 f. *arcanis* applied to the Muses indicates the poet's intention of giving to the Romans an astrological work.

5, pp. 158–159. A. Zimmermann, Zur Duenosinschrift. (1) If Thurneysen (K. Z. 35, p. 204) is right in maintaining that *duenos med feced* etc. contains a word-play, " ein Guter hat mich gemacht für einen Guten ", then the Praenestine fibula also may have a word-play: Ein Guter hat mich gemacht für einen Begüterten. (2) 'opet oitesiai, etc. = " wenn du dich durch Vermittelung der Göttin des Brauchens (i. e. by the gift of an object for use) zur Versöhnung nicht bewegen lassen willst ". opet = oped (CIL XI, 3078). oitesia = dea quae praeest rebus utendis; cf. Fructesea Aug. c. d. 4, 24.

6, pp. 159–160. A. Laudien. Plutarchea. A list of hitherto neglected manuscripts of the Lives.

VII, pp. 161–195. W. F. Otto, Die Luperci und die Feier der Lupercalien. Summary on p. 190 ff. The ancients conceived the Lupercalia as a festival for the purification of the community and the warding off of evil. The purification was symbolically effected on the persons of two noble youths and by the atonement sacrifice of a dog. The warding off of evil was accomplished originally by two naked priests of the god who ran through the city; later when the ritual combined fertility with purification, they carried the *amiculum Iunonis* (the magic thong made from the skin of a sacrificed goat) with which they struck women whom they met. Lupercus means 'wolfish', 'wolf-like'. It is originally the name not of the priest of Faunus but of Faunus himself. Lycaeus (Pan) whose statue was naked and girt with a skin, like the Luperci

when they ran. Faunus is the god of the Lupercalia; originally, Faunus was not a shepherd-god. He belongs with Mars; his voice is heard in battles; the wolf belongs to them both. Further investigation of the legend of Romulus may shed additional light on this question.

VIII, pp. 196–205. E. v. Druffel, Papyrologisches. 1. Pap. Grenf. I, 11. Besides the duplicate Nr. 1277, the Heidelberg Library has in Nr. 1288 a fragment, in another hand, belonging to the same document. It is of juristic interest and mentions opponents in the petition possibly not identical with those in the earlier case. (2) On the Hermias suit.

IX, pp. 206–224. H. Rubenbauer, Der Bau des trochäischen Tetrameters in der neueren Komödie. The trochaic tetrameter of comedy is less freely formed than the iambic trimeter. Pure tetrameters are used ra·her rarely (1 in 23.5); verses with resolutions more frequently, in keeping with the colloquial form of the discourse. The dactyl, allowed by Euripides in proper names, was admitted also in common nouns; its formation was strict. Diaeresis is rarely neglected. Menander always uses it, although it is often apparent to the eye only where a verse is divided between speakers. Menander allows himself greater freedom, yet he is careful not to mar the smoothness and finish of the tetrameter.

X, pp. 225–249. L. Gurlitt, Plautinische Studien. An examination of cases of *double entendre,* where honesto verbo vitiosa res appellatur: e. g. asta=hasta (φαλλός) Most. I, 4; Asin. III, 3, 112; Miles III, 3, 61–68 also Miles 1018.

XI, pp. 250–262. F. Görres, Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Licinius. (Contributions to the criticism of the sources for the age of Diocletian and Constantine.) Licinius is known for his friendliness towards the Christians between 311 and 319; and his persecution of the church in his last years. He kept aloof from the persecution of 302/3–305 from antipathy to the Neoplatonists, the chief instigators. His later hostile attitude was due principally to the Christians themselves.

XII, pp. 263–277. W. A. Baehrens, Propertiana. I. Propertius never uses an adjective at the pentameter close, except in cases where the substantive with which it agrees, could not stand at the close, but only before the caesura. Hence in III 13, 56 read *tuo*; II. 9. 12 *flavis . . vadis*; III. 7, 42 *soli . . . doli*; II. 29 b, 36 *volutantis.* II. On the principle of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ *et . . . . quique* is retained in IV 11, 39–40. III. II 2, 6 is explained as a mixture of two constructions: *incedit vel Iove digna* and *incedit ceu Iovis soror.* IV. In I 8, 19–20 the reading of the archetype *ut te* is defended by the use in I 11, 9–10.

V. In I 8, 25 retain *Atraciis*.   P. forgetting his mythology has
confused two Hippodamias.   VI. In I 21, 9 read *quaecumque*
and in vs. 6 *et* for *ne*.   VII. In II 13, 47 read *cui si* for *quis*.
VIII. II 17, 1–4 should be joined to elegy 16.   IX. Hosius'
reading in II 20, 8 is defended by examples.   X. In III 13, 8
retain *pastor*.   XI. In III 13, 59 *verus* is defended.   XII.
Transpositions by certain scholars are shown to be needless.

XIII, pp. 278–297.   J. Brummer, Zur Ueberlieferungsge-
schichte der sogenannten Donat-Vita des Vergil.   The Vita by
Donatus has descended through a double tradition, (1) the
common, much padded form Ω, and (2) the fragments in *S*
and *m*.   The latter together with the vita Gudiana prima may
be referred to the school of Eriugena where there was still in
use a more original Donatus than in the form Ω.   *S* and *m* are
clumsy workings over of their copy.   The MSS containing
the vita in its common form are in two classes: *G*Σ and
MERABP.   The vita in Ω was again interpolated, at the
latest, in the fourteenth century, from a MS of the *G* grade.
Only the data in Hieronymus go back directly to Suetonius.

XIV, pp. 298–308.   S. Brassloff, Beiträge zum Juristen-
latein.   I. *Quando* occurs in juristic Latin not only in the
temporal and causal, but also in an explicative and adversative
sense.   The adversative use goes back to the *legis actio per
manus iniectionem*.   The causal use is definitely proved only
for Africanus' *Quaestiones* and Claudius Tryphoninus.   In
other cases it is due to citation of an earlier authority or
Justinian's interpolation.   II. The use of *id* referring to a
preceding masculine or feminine.   The cases are the fault of
the compilers.

Miscellen.

7, pp. 309–311.   A. Zimmermann.   Randglossen.   Continued
from Philol. 65, p. 478.   3. πλευρά=costa=wife, in Christian
times.   4. Tecusa (τεκοῦσα)=mater.   CIL. III 8752 and 10611.
5. In CIL. IX 5771 pellex=filia; perhaps connected with
παλλάς, θυγάτηρ (Διός).   It is suggested also that 'Αφαία is from
ἄππα, a pet name for father.

8, pp. 311–312.   A. Laudien, Zur Ilias A 50 f.   Hagenbeck's
experiences with his menagerie in Hamburg are cited to illus-
trate the sensitiveness of animals to infection through drink-
ing water, long before the pestilence affected men.

9, pp. 312–316.   J. Miller: Nochmals die 16. Epode des
Horaz.   A rejoinder to Kukula (Römische Säkularpoesie,
Teubner, 1911).   The epode, like 1, 9 and 13, is *not* satirical.
Hiemer's explanation (Ellwanger progr. 1905), that the epode

is a reply to Vergil's Ecl. IV, is accepted.   Horace's *vate me* answers the prophet of the fourth eclogue.

10. pp. 316–317.   G. A. Gerhard, Zur Priesterliste des ptolemäischen Urkundenprotokolls.

11. pp. 317–320.   O. Weinreich, Die falsche Astraia.   An example from Carl Spitteler (Olympischer Frühling, Bd. II. 100 f.) of the use of the same motif as Wieland may have taken from Lucian (Alex. 39) for his Peregrinus Proteus.

XV, pp. 321–337.   A. Müller, Die Schimpfwörter in der griechischen Komödie.   The cases occurring in direct address are classified according as the speaker (1) alludes to the interlocutor's appearance, lack of intellect, moral character, individual traits, manner of life, misery etc.; or (2) uses names of animals or (3) certain formulas of imprecation.   Words of abuse occur in the plays of Aristophanes per 100 verses as follows: Av. .8; Ach. 1.2; Lys. and Ran. 1.3; Vesp. and Eccl. 1.4; Eq. 1.6; Thesm. 1.7; Pax 1.9; Plut. 2.2; Nub. 2.5.

XVI, pp. 338–357.   H. F. Müller, Plotinos über die Vorsehung.   Examination of the views on divine Providence given in Ennead. III books 2 and 3.   Plotinos' estimate of the world and human life is thoroughly Greek even in its onesidedness and limitations; he undervalues the masses and exalts the aristocracy of the spirit.   Thoroughly Greek also are his cheerful optimism, his lively feeling for the beauty of the world, and his unbroken confidence in the moral strength of man, who bears what is necessary, because he sees through it, and tries to overcome evil by virtue.

XVII, pp. 358–372.   W. Soltau, Classis und Classes in Rom.   (1) The Etruscan despots created a new army organization which added to the old levy the second and third *classes*.   (2) This Servian army fought the fight for freedom, was augmented by the *seniores*, chose its leaders, and remained the active army.   (3) The plebs not included organized themselves for political purposes.   (4) Soon after the decemvirs the traditional organization of the army was gradually superseded by the manipular.   Hence the use of the Servian army for political purposes was precluded.   " Army " and " Voters " were differentiated.   (5) The transition from the purely military *exercitus Servianus* with limited number of centuries, to a *comitiatus maximus*, which included the whole Roman people, must have been made much earlier than the change in the number of tribes.   (6) Numismatic evidence would make the end of the 4th cent. B. C., (the introduction of coinage) the earliest date for a perfect voting organization of the people according to census.

XVIII, pp. 372–391. O. Könnecke, Zu Theokrit. (1) 7, 122 f. πόδας τρίβωμες refers to standing before the door, not to 'das Nachlaufen des ganzen Tages' (v. Wilamowitz). (2) 10, 18. χροϊξεῖται, passive; 'sie wird von dir die Nacht hindurch geliebkost werden. (3) 22. Rejects v. Wilamowitz' view (Textgeschichte, p. 182 ff.) that there is a long lacuna after 170 and that the part following is the conclusion of a speech by Kastor. (4) Discussion of textual points in 22. (5) 24; 15. We must assume that *each* of the σταθμά had a hole, so that the two snakes passed through, each through a separate hole. V. 31 ὀψίγονον refers to the retarded birth of Herakles. In v. 74 θέσθαι is to be retained.

XIX, pp. 392–402. W. Gurlitt (†), De hiatu in Dionysii Halicarnasensis de antiquitatibus Romanis libris obvio. An examination of books I–VI shows that D. sought to avoid hiatus caused by the concurrence of two long vowels or a long and a short vowel. But he allows hiatus in certain cases; where the article, or καί would be spoken with crasis; after ἤ, μή, δή (εἰ and εὖ once each); in some set phrases; after enclitic forms of εἶναι; between adjective (or numeral) and its substantive; between infinitive and the verb on which it depends, in short clauses (mostly relative) of 2–3 words; in certain formulas; if there is some punctuation. MS discrepancies make 501 cases of hiatus suspicious. Most are remediable with a slight change or transposition.

XX, pp. 403–413. F. Lammert, De C. Iulii Solini Collectaneis a Guidone de Bazochiis adhibitis. Guido was born before the middle of the 12th cent. He should be added to the lists of Mommsen (ed. alt. p. 25–29) and Manitius (Philol. 47 and 51) of those who used Solinus.

XXI, pp. 414–441. Th. O. H. Achelis, De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum. I. Later grammarians made false ascriptions to A. (continued on pp. 518–545).

Miscellen.

12, p. 442. C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, Zu Herodots persischer Steuerliste. A rejoinder to F. H. Weissbach, Philol. 71, 479 ff.

13, pp. 442–444. A. Müller, Der Schauplatz in Aristophanes' Wespen V. 1122 ff. The action takes place outside the front of the house.

14, pp. 444–447. S. Eitrem, Die Hera mit der Schere. There was once at Argos a cult-statue of Hera represented as holding bronze shears,—a reference to her function of *pronuba*, who cut the bride's hair.

15, pp. 447–448. H. Blumner, Ἅλες. Apparently the only

place in Greek where ἅλες = sales = wit is Plut. Comp. Aristoph. et Menand. 4, p. 854 C. The gloss (C. Gl. II 177, 22) merely translates the Latin *sales*.

XXII, pp. 449–456. P. Maas, Verschiedenes. (1) Excerpts from Strabo in Psellos. Quotations from Strabo 9, c. 1–2 suggest two readings which should be noted by editors of Strabo. (2) Hesychios, father of Synesios of Kyrene. Note on Syn. Hymn. 8, 29 ff. and Ep. 53. (3) Paroemiographica. 5 notes on proverbs containing ancient verses. (4) Theocritus 15, 8. For τῆνος read Δῖνος a possible secondary form for Δίνων (v. 12). (5) Simias Πτέρυγες 10; read πραΰνόῳ. (6) Note on Alciphro Ep. 4, 16. Read δειπνήσεις τὰ 'Αφροδίσια. ποιῶ etc. (7) Aristoph. Thesm. 1181. Read ἀνῶμεν for ἄνωθεν. (8) Pind. Isthm. VI 72. Read τὸν ἄνδρα for νιν ἄνδρα.

XXIII, pp. 457–464. P. Corssen, Die epischen Gedichte des Euphorion. The poem 'Ησίοδος ascribed to Euphorion by Suidas was probably called Γῆς Περίοδος; many of Euphorion's fragments seem to point towards this assumption.

XXIV, pp. 465–483. K. Svoboda, Die Abfassungszeit des Geschichtswerkes des Polybios. Summary, p. 483. Before 146 B. C. Polybios had written what is now contained in I–XXXI 21 (XXXII 2). At the end of his internment in Rome he began to publish the history, but in consequence of the stormy occurrences of the year 146 he reached only books IV or V. After 146 the work was interrupted for a long time, and not continued and finished until after the composition of the book on the Numantine war. Only book III was especially prepared for the new edition. (This article appeared in the Bohemian "Listy filologické" (1913, p. 12 f.) and was translated to give the results of the investigation a wider usefulness).

XXV, pp. 484–491. G. A. Gerhard, Der Prolog des Persius. Papyrus finds have shown that the choliambic meter was a favorite for the popular-philosophical diatribe of the stoic and cynic satirical type. Varro used this meter among others in his Menippean satires. Lucilius passed from varied meters to the hexameter. The metrical difference between the prologue and the satires proper of Persius is like that between the satirical Hellenistic diatribe and the standardized Roman satire. Before Persius wrote Roman satire in the meter of Lucilius and Horace, he wrote choliambics; and of these youthful verses from his early stoic period the introductory verses have come down to us as a so-called prologue. The views of F. Leo (Hermes, XLV, 1910, p. 48) and E. Gaar (Wiener Studien, XXXI, 1909, pp. 128–135, 233–243) and others are subjected to examination.

7

XXVI, pp. 492–502.   A. Müller, Die Schimpfwörter in der
römischen Komödie.   The 160 terms of abuse are classified
according to the speaker and the person addressed.

XXVII, pp. 503–517.   P. Lehmann, Cassiodorstudien (con-
tinued from Philol. LXX 1, 278–299).   III. Lost Writings?
Although some works have been lost, the ascription to Cassio-
dorus of a commentary on Aristotle, and even a translation of
Aristotle, arose from a misunderstanding by Manitius (Ge-
schichte der lat. Lit. des Mittelalters, p. 46) of a quotation
from Boethius by Cassiodorus.   IV. Isidore of Seville's de-
pendence on Cassiodorus.   There is a striking recurrence in
the text of Isidore of stylistic peculiarities of Cassiodorus,
especially in passages where, on other grounds also, close rela-
tionship is evident.   The parts used were the second book of
the Institutiones, the Liber de orthographia and the Historia
tripartita.

XXVIII, pp. 518–545.   Th. O. H. Achelis, De Aristophanis
Byzantii argumentis fabularum.   II. (Continued from pp.
414–441).   Critical analysis of the formulas used in the ὑπο-
θέσεις for the purpose of finding a norm by which to determine
if possible, which are genuine.   (To be continued).

Miscellen.

16, p. 546.   O. Weinreich, Ein Gedicht des Aristoteles.
(Bergk PLG.⁴ II 336).   Immisch's emendation (Philol. 65,
p. 1 f.) is unnecessary.   The genitive (v. 2) without χάριν or
ἕνεκα is found in other dedicatory inscriptions.

17, pp. 546–548.   E. von Stern, Graffiti.   Two inscriptions,
giving the ancient name of the object, to be added to the col-
lection of P. Wolters, Eingeritzte Inschriften auf Vasen
(Ath. Mitt. 1913, 193 ff.).

18, pp. 548–552.   A. Sonny, Zur Moskauer Sammlung mit-
telgriechischer Sprichwörter.   Supplementary to C. E Gleye's
article in Philol. 71, 527 ff.   New readings and interpretations
with parallels are offered for the following proverbs, accord-
ing to Gleye's numbering: 1–4; 10; 14; 16–17; 42; 48; 61;
63; 78; 88; 97–99; 102; 115–116; 118–119; 123; 130.

19, pp. 552–556.   K. Preisendanz, Die Homeromantie Pap.
Lond. CXXI.   The oracle complete had 6 times 36 verses, 216
being 3 times the sacred number 72.   An attempt is made to
arrange the 28 fragments.

<div align="right">George Dwight Kellogg.</div>

Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Vol. LXIX (1914)
pts. 3, 4.

Pp. 427–463. Drei Gedichte des Properz (continued from
p. 413). Felix Jacoby. On the interpretation of poems II
24 A and III 8.

Pp. 464–476. A che punto siamo coll' interpretazione dei
testi etruschi? Elia Lattes. La formola finale di alcune epi-
grafi.

Pp. 477–490. Das Pilum des Polybios. A. Schulten. A
description of some ancient weapons recently found at Nu-
mantia. None of them corresponds exactly to Polybios' de-
scription of the pilum, but they serve to explain and supplement
it.

Pp. 491–514. Wiederholungen bei älteren griechischen und
lateinischen Autoren (continued from Vol. LXVII, pp. 515
ff.). W. Bannier. Examples from early prose and verse of
the repetition (1) of principal verbs (2) of substantives (3)
of prepositions (in stating both the general and the particular
place). These repetitions are so numerous, and many of them
so well attested, that classical editors should have been less
prejudiced against them, and less reauy to remove them from
their texts. They served to avoid ambiguity or to add to the
rhetorical effect.

Pp. 515–521. Zum Aias des Sophokles. J. M. Stahl. At
966 read οὐ κείνοις γλυκύς. At 1311 read τῆς σῆς ὑπὲρ γυναικὸς
αὐτοῦ σοῦ θ' ὁμαίμονος.

Pp. 522–537. Zur kyklischen Theogonie. Johannes Dietze.
A comparison of the accounts given by Hesiod and Apollo-
doros.

Pp. 538–557. Zu den griechischen Bukolikern. Otto Kön-
necke. In Theocr. Epigr. 22, ῎Αλλος ὁ Χῖος, κ. τ. λ., the ' Chian '
is not Homer, but Theocritus of Chios. In Theocr. 3. 28–30
the thing used in the augury is perhaps a pod of the ' bladder-
senna' (*colutĕa*). This was placed in the hollow of the elbow,
and crushed by suddenly bending the arm. In Theocr. 7. 4–6
τῶν χαῶν is partitive genitive with εἴ τί περ ἐσθλόν = ἐσθλότατοι
and εἴ τί περ κτλ. refers to Κλυτίας καὶ Χάλκωνος: ' Phrasidamos
und Antigenes, abstammend von Klytia und Chalkon, den
trefflichsten der Edeln der Vorzeit '. In Theocr. 15. 7 read τὺ
δ' ἑκαστέρω αἰὲν ἀποικεῖς: 'du ziehst jedesmal (bei jedem Woh-
nungswechsel) weiter hinaus '. In Theocr. 15. 16 (πάντα . .

ἀγοράσδων) read, with Ahrens, βάντα .. ἀγοράσδειν.   In Moschus,
2. 61, ταρσοῖς should be kept, against Wilamowitz' conjecture
ταρσός: 'wie wenn ein Schiff mit seinen Ruderblättern den
Rand des Korbes beschattete' (περίσκεπε ταρσοῖς).   The scenes
portrayed on Europa's basket were probably on the inside—
as the scenes portrayed on Theocritus' cup were on the inside.
<See the article by A. S. F. Gow, 'The Cup in the First Idyll
of Theocritus', Journal of Hellenic Studies, XXXIII (1913)
207–222.>   In Mosch. 2. 155 read, with Meineke, κεἰ for καί.
In his edition of the text (1914) Könnecke printed this con-
jecture as his own, not knowing that Meineke had anticipated
him.   Now he reproaches his predecessors for ignoring
Meineke's reading, and so leading him into a false position.
<It is accepted, and credit given to Meineke, in the edition of
J. M. Edmonds, London, 1912.>   In the Lament for Bion he
rejects Wilamowitz' conjecture γῆρας ἀείδει (16) and his read-
ing ὑμεῖς (49); also Hermann's ποθέει, for φιλέει, (68) and
Kaibel's ποχ', for τοι, (71).   He prefers ἀπέλειψας to ἀπέλειπες
(97).   He rejects Wilamowitz' ταῖς, for τοῖς, (107) and
Wakefield's ὧν, for ἐν, (before σιγᾷ, 105).   Καὶ παρὰ Κώρᾳ (119)
is right.   In Mosch. Megara, 67–68, read, ὅστ' ἀναριθμήτοισιν ..
θαρσοίη.

Pp. 558–564. Antike Messungen der Landenge von Suez.
Oskar Viedebantt.   The measurements of the Isthmus given
by Greek and Roman writers all go back to early measure-
ments in Egyptian 'schoinoi'.   These early measurements
attained a high degree of precision, but their value was sadly
impaired when they were converted into stades by Greek
writers who did not understand them,

Miszellen.—Pp. 565–567. Otto Seeck.   Das Epigramm des
Germanus und seine Ueberschrift (Anth. Pal. XIV 148).—Pp.
567–568.   A. Ludwich.   Zu Tryphiodoros.   Textual notes.—
Pp. 569–570.   A. Ludwich.   Zu Musaios.   Textual notes, on
lines 5, 225, 272.—Pp. 570–574.   H. Heimannsfeld.   Zum
Text des Helladius bei Photius (cod. 279).—Pp. 575–576.   H.
Schenkl.   Der Dichter der Ilias Latina.—Pp. 576–580.   A.
Klotz.   Zu Cic. pro Milone 2.   Examines, and rejects, Th.
Birt's argument that we should assume a long lacuna before
the beginning of the second chapter.—Pp. 580–584.   E. Hohl.
Reste einer Handschrift des Kollektaneums des Sedulius
Scottus in Paris.—Pp. 585–586.   A. Brinkmann.   Lücken-
büsser.   Further notes on the burning mountain in Lycia
(Olympos).   See pp. 424–426.

Pp. 587–596. Arion und Thespis.   J. M. Stahl.   Discussion
of a statement in Johannes' commentary on Hermogenes: τῆς
δὲ τραγῳδίας πρῶτον δρᾶμα ᾿Αρίων ὁ Μηθυμναῖος εἰσήγαγεν, ὥσπερ Σόλων
ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγραφομέναις ᾿Ελεγείαις ἐδίδαξε.

Pp. 597–614. Zu Sophokles. Th. Birt. In Antig. 691 read λόγοις τε τούτοις, at 24, χρηστῶς (for χρησθείς), at 4, οὐδὲν γὰρ οὔτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὔτ' ἄτης ἄπο, at 140, δεξιόχειρος. In Elec. 1344 read τελουμένων εἴποιμ' ἂν ὧδε · νῦν ἔχειν|καλῶς τὰ κείνων πάντα κᾆτα μὴ καλῶς, in Oed. Col. 711, εὔιππον εἰπών νιν εὐθάλασσον, in Ajax, 178, εἰν ἐλαφηβολίαις.

Pp. 615–624. Herodot und Cortona. A. Rosenberg. An examination of Herodotos I 57 (reading Κρότωνα for Κρηστῶνα). He could have had no special knowledge about any Pelasgians in Etruria.

Pp. 625–629. Ein römischer Epikureer. F. Münzer. Note on L. Saufeius, the friend of Nepos and Atticus. Probably he is the Saufeius who is quoted by Servius, on Aen. I 6.

Pp. 630–641. Die vordere, bisher verloren geglaubte Hälfte des Vossianischen Ausonius-Kodex. S. Tafel. This has been found in Cod. Lat. Paris. 8093.

Pp. 642–679. Studien über den griechischen Artikel. H. Kallenberg. An important study of the use of the article with numerals: (1) with round numbers, (2) with fractions, (3) with ordinals. The phrase μετὰ τρίτην ἡρέραν is discussed in an appendix.

Pp. 680–734. Die Quellenberichte über Aristarchs Ilias-Athetesen. A. Ludwich. A long criticism of Adolf Römer's ' Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik ' (Leipzig, 1912).

Pp. 735–741. Die Abfassungszeit der Horazoden II 6 und III 29. R. Philippson. The poems are assigned to the year 25.

Miszellen.—Pp. 742–744. F. Novotný. Ὅτι und ὡς in Platons Briefen.—P. 744. Otto Immisch. Ad Aristotelis poet. cap. 18. Read δεῖ δὲ ἄμφω ἀρτικροτεῖσθαι.—Pp. 744–746. Νῖκος Α. Βέης. Die frühbyzantinische Grabinschrift eines Arztes.

W. P. Mustard.

The Johns Hopkins University.

BRIEF MENTION.

A familiar illustration of the ruling passion strong in death
is furnished by the dying words of the old French gram-
marian: 'Je vais ou je vas mourir; l'un et l'autre se disent';
and I suppose that I shall continue to repeat my little syntac-
tical formulae to the end. Even in this day of wrath, when
the jar of conflict is felt to the remotest verge of the world,
I find myself repeating the statement: Verbs of vision in
Greek as a rule take present and perfect participles. These
are the ordinary conditions of actual vision. There are two
notorious exceptions—ἐπιδεῖν, 'to live to see', and περιιδεῖν, 'to
fail to see'. These are often followed by the aorist participle.
The negative explanation of περιιδεῖν, which I adduced years
and years ago (Morris-Classen Thuk. 1, 24; A. J. P. X 124),
is not wholly satisfactory. The verbs are not to be separated.
They are not verbs of vision pure and simple. They have a
moral sense. They involve will and wish. περιιδεῖν may be a
wilful ignoring, 'to shut one's eyes to'; ἐπιδεῖν involves desire
or dread. Alas for life as mirrored in language! Scan the
passages in which ἐπιδεῖν occurs. It is enough to make one a
pessimist. But I drop the grammarian, and leave the statis-
tics to those who are carried away with the *furor arithmeticus.*

———

What have I not lived to see, if only from afar. My mem-
ory goes back to the Seminole war, and as a child I went to
Fort Moultrie in order to get sight of Osceola; but the hero
was not on exhibition that day. I was only to see his grave;
and from that time on war has followed war—almost every
one brought to the consciousness by personal interest or per-
sonal contact with the actors. I have lived through four
years of the Civil War—more than four years, if one counts
prelude and postlude of the great red game. I know the life
of the fireside and the life of the field. The conditions of the
present wrestling-match—the grimmest of the ages—are dif-
ferent, but at bottom war is the same. I think of the scholars
that have taken the field on this side and that. Some of them
I know personally. I understand them. Paul Cauer's Gram-
matica Militans, ominous title, is on my study table. I open
the last number of the 1914 Jahrbücher, and learn that he is
in the field. Ilberg tarries by the stuff. To judge by my own

experience the man in the field is the happier. The first article is by WILHELM NESTLE. It deals with Thukydides. This is my Aristophanic year, but Aristophanes means the Peloponnesian War, and the Peloponnesian War is the pivot about which so much of my work as a teacher revolves. The note-books from which these trivialities are taken bear Aristophanic titles—σκαριφισμοί, κοσκυλμάτια, πομφολυγοπαφλά- σματα, but of the two interpreters of that typical struggle I find myself turning from the comic mask of the 'baldhead bard' to the grave countenance of the historian; and Thukydides shall be the chief contributor to the *Brief Mention* of this number.

NESTLE's article is a companion-piece to his Euripides (A. J. P. XXIII 111) and is called *Thukydides u. die Sophistik.* To him Thukydides is the 'Geschichtschreiber der griechischen Aufklärung', as Euripides is the 'Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung', though the natures of the two rationalists are far different. Thukydides' rupture with the traditional reli- gion is more complete than that of Euripides, whose poetical soul longs every now and then for the old faith (A. J. P. XXX 227). Thukydides simply ignores the gods <E. caelo deripit ille deos>. A striking contrast is Herodotos, who, while he could not withdraw himself from the mighty move- ment of the times, went no farther than a rather tame ration- alism, <after a fashion that reminds one of Pindar and Pa- laiphatos>. But for Herodotos the moral government of God abides; <for him an increasing purpose runs through the ages.> He looks upon the world with the artistic vision of Aischylos or Sophokles, rather than with the cold eye and cool blood of the investigator of history. <He is, in short, a good Church of Greece man (A. J. P. XVII 127).> Thuky- dides' programme is not the momentary diversion of hearer or reader, but the ascertainment of the truth (τὸ σαφές). <Only τὸ σαφές is not τὸ ὄν. It is non-committal, as is so much in Thukydides.> This bent toward the real, this *Wirklichkeits- sinn,* shews itself, says NESTLE, in the pragmatic character of Thukydides' work and style. <If the world were only agreed on the meaning of 'pragmatic!'> It is not necessary, therefore, to advance as an explanation the northern barbaric blood that flowed in his veins (cf. A. J. P. XXXIII 238), as did Wila- mowitz, <despite the fact that Karl Blind claimed him as a German, and the other fact that the Holkham bust has the type of an English gentleman—an untranslatable type>. This makes him, according to NESTLE <and a thousand others>, the first historian in the modern sense, <despite the deliberate limitation of his vision, which forms a striking contrast to the

wider sweep which makes Herodotos akin to the historians of
to-day (A. J. P. XVII 127)>.

— — —

Thukydides' passion for the truth is not a flame, but a hid-
den fire. He is not a propagandist. In religious matters he
maintains <the> reserve <of the superior person>. He rec-
ognizes religion as a power; <he would have recognized it in
Cromwell and his Ironsides>. When he develops his own
views, he refrains from any religious philosophy. Note the
eloquent silence in his introduction. But we must remember
that the philosophic content of his work resides in the speeches,
and we must not attribute to him the sentiments of his char-
acters. He is a dramatic poet. His work is an historical
drama, as Otfried Müller puts it. <Indeed, Mr. Cornford
frankly calls him 'mythistoricus' (A. J. P. XXVIII 356)>.
Far different are his δημηγορίαι from the discourses of Hero-
dotos. Like the tragic poets, Herodotos uses his *sermones* to
open our vision into the dealings, <into the *poscaenia*>, of
the divinity. Thukydides, like an apt pupil of the sophists,
builds his speeches in the main on the ἀντιλέγειν business, but
in spite of his art we can see behind the mask of the speaker
the clear and serious eye of the writer. <A difficult matter,
Herr NESTLE, if it were not for the simple rule given by
Bury. According to Bury, the harder Thukydides is to un-
derstand, the more perverse his style, the nearer are we to the
real Thukydides.> Like the sophists, Tkukydides is averse
from speculative philosophy. Antiquity has called him a pupil
of Anaxagoras, and branded him as an atheist, <though, to be
sure, ἄθεος does not mean atheist in the modern sense>, but
there is no Νοῦς (with a capital N) in Thukydides. Earth-
quakes, inundations, volcanic eruptions, eclipses, tempests, are
mentioned, but only because of their historical consequences
or their effect on popular belief; nor does he spare the super-
stition of a statesman and a general of whom he thought so
highly as he thought of Nikias, <though what he really
thought of Nikias is another story>. His famous description
of the plague shews how thoroughly trained he was in the
observation of natural phenomena—<a vivid description, in-
deed, in which modern physicians have seen every kind of
contagion, bubonic plague, syphilis, what not?> All that
happens is to him the working of an unvarying machine. He
believes in the 'Gesetzmässigkeit alles Geschehens', and we
trace in him the teachings of Demokritos. The law of uni-
formity that he recognizes in the world without, he recognizes
also in human nature, which the sophists regarded as the
proper study of mankind. The soul of Sophistic is intellec-

tualism. There is no ethical judgment of actions—no good, no bad, no ὕβρις, only 'right' and 'wrong' in the sense of adaptation of means to end. His whole terminology is intellectual, not ethical. σύνεσις was the watchword of his time. πρόνοια is human foresight, not divine. In his ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας he discards myth and anecdote, <though he is not proof against *bons mots*—Who is?> For him there was no golden age; nor any speculations as to primitive man. He is on his guard against exaggeration of former exploits. To him the Peloponnesian war was greater than the Trojan. He uses his Homer as evidence of social and cultural conditions, and recognizes an advance, <though there is no divine plan for the education of the race, no modern God in History, no ratchet-wheel movement from without>. No myths of the gods. No enthusiasms about heroes. The Trojan war he considers historical. <If he lived in our day, he would have escaped the sun-stroke, cf. A. J. P. XXIX 117)>.

In NESTLE'S opinion there was no recognition of a 'sittliche Weltordnung', no sublimation of Τύχη into Providence, <no ἰοχέαιρα Τύχη, no Διὸς πλαγὰν ἔχουσιν εἰπεῖν, A. J. P. XXIII 347.> Chance is sheer chance, <not even as Swinburne has it, 'chance central of circumstance'>. Cult and violations of cult are mentioned only when they are significant for the course of events, nor always without an intimation of the insincerity or the weakness of those who used them or were swayed by them. For the whole brood of soothsayers, the whole apparatus of oracles, he does not pretend to disguise his contempt, <any more, say, than our orthodox friend Aristophanes>.

τὸ θεῖον is a mere δόξα. The only rule to follow is the φύσις ἀναγκαία, the inviolable rule to which the world within is subject, as is the world without. There is no ethic even when a definite personality speaks. <Why then make allowances, as NESTLE bids us do?> The God Pan has nothing to do with panic, <any more than the σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν has to do with Pindar.> Scares are catching, that is all. The Spartans march to the sound of the fife, not for the sake of τὸ θεῖον, but simply because of the psychological effect of music <a familiar doctrine from Tyrtaios to Rudyard Kipling—but no details are given as to the character of Dorian moods and Lydian airs>. Crime and punishment—everyday themes with the Sophists—are discussed in the speech of Diodotos: πεφύκασί τε ἅπαντες καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ ἁμαρτάνειν. <But ἁμαρτάνειν is not to be

rendered 'Verbrechen' (A. J. P. XXXV 386) as it is rendered by
NESTLE>.   Human nature is prone to make mistakes—so prone
that no law, no νόμος—<for νόμος is not 'law'>—can check it.
Such is human nature, and such it will ever be.   The only
wickedness is weakness of judgment.   The trouble must be
met by intelligence—<Jefferson's remedy>.   Punishment as
vengeance, <I will repay, saith the Lord> as a deterrent, as a
means of reformation, is naught.   τιμωρία and κόλασις are
naught.   'Tis a pessimistic creed: σύνεσις cannot make head
against ἐπιθυμία.   φύσις gets the better of νόμος more and more.
He says, as Euripides says, μέγιστον ἄρ' ἦν ἡ φύσις.   <Nay, he
is one with Pindar in the exaltation of φύσις, and Isokrates
was to be one with both.>   Thukydides is an aristocrat at
heart.   NESTLE has not recognized any special use of ἀρετή in
Thukydides.   He employs it, we are told, in the usual signifi-
cance of the word.   <But the Thukydidean theory reduces it,
as I have said, to 'efficiency' (A. J. P. XXXV 367)—the
adaptation of means to an end.   ἀρετή consists in getting
things done.   It lacks moral content as much as does its an-
tithesis ἁμαρτία.   νόμος is Use and Wont.   Its sway was recog-
nized by Pindar, who made it an absolute rule—νόμος τύραννος>.
The law of nature is the rule of the stronger for the world
without.   It is also the law of the world within.   Might
makes right.   The only check is the inevitable law of decay—
the inevitable ups and downs of life.   The whole scheme is
dramatically worked out in the debate between Melians and
Athenians.   The Athenians are ruthless in the proclamation
of their programme.   Thukydides points no moral.   <It is
the old, old story—An nescis longas regibus esse manus?
The Melian Aphrodite is powerless.   She has lost her arms.
What Athens was to lose afterwards matters not—the awful
sequel of the 'Wille zur Macht', of which one hears so much
nowadays>.   Classen would have us believe that Thukydides
is following the lines of documents preserved in the archives
of Athens, <a notion begotten by German practise>.   Nay,
says NESTLE.   The dialogue is a sophistic debate in which the
traditional view of the course of this world is upheld against
the real laws that regulate the currents of events.   It is an
ἀντιλογία, which, however, leaves us in no doubt as to the side
which Thukydides accepts <we must not say Thukydides 'fa-
vors'>.   But form and content go back to sophistic exem-
plars, to Gorgias, to Euripides.   We hear the echo in the ἀγών
of the Clouds; and the anonymous Athenians of the Melian
dialogue find their spokesman in the Kallikles of Plato's Gorgias
and the Menon of the Anabasis.   In political life the doctrine
'Might makes right' is accepted as the practical formula.
Moral indignation is out of place in calculating the forces of
history.   Nietzsche interprets the dialogue as Nietzsche might

be expected to interpret it. <Indeed, Nietzsche, whose boy-hood was influenced by Theognis (A. J. P. XXXIII 106), may in riper years have been inspired by Thukydides (A. J. P. XXII 232)>. Nor does NESTLE spare us the inevitable parallel of Machiavelli. <Unfortunately, Thukydides offers no parallel for the trumpet-note of Petrarch, which forms the memorable close of 'Il Principe'—a note that resounds and will resound through the ages so long as there is such a thing as nationality.>

This brings us to the chapter of Thukydides' attitude to-ward the parties of his day. He is no believer in political Utopias. Himself an aristocrat, he maintains his independence of oligarchs and democrats alike, and declares himself in fa-vor of the compromise government of the Five Thousand as the best he had lived to see <a bitterer sarcasm than is to be found in Tacitus>. Ὁμόνοια was the watchword of the time, as it is the title of a discourse of Antiphon the Sophist, whom NESTLE is inclined to identify with Antiphon the statesman, whom Thukydides praises as he praises Nikias <both eulogies open to interpretation, for as NESTLE himself says, all Thuky-dides' estimates of character are based on political evidence, quite apart from what we should call moral standards>. The Epitaphios of Pericles is a glorification of Athenian cul-ture, of the Athenian spirit—not of Athenian political life. <Ὁμόνοια, by the way, is the name of one of the two great squares of Modern Athens (Place de la Concorde). One wonders what Thukydides would have thought of the Greeks of to-day.> NESTLE seems to think that Thukydides favored the régime of the μέσοι πολῖται, <but for that matter Pindar has been claimed for the same régime (I. E. xxvi), and with as much foundation>. His ideal—if he had any ideal— was the one man rule of Perikles. For the ὄχλος, the πολὺς ὅμιλος, he does not disguise his contempt. It is simply a force to be used. Thukydides as the aristocrat could hardly have been, thinks NESTLE, in sympathy with Perikles' praise of lib-erty and the equality of all the citizens in the management of the State. These are real forces, not to be underrated so long as they are swayed by genius. The trouble is the inevi-table tendency of democracy to the one man power—a τυραννίς in fact, if not in name. Perikles, Kleon, Hyperbolos are the masters; <their rule was a monitory and minatory rule>. As for foreign relations, Thukydides recognizes <as all antiq-uity recognized, as the language itself shews> that war is the rule and peace the exception. <Ares holds the scales, the grim χρυσαμοιβός, as Aischylos calls him>. The balance of power is the balance of fear—τὸ ἀντίπαλον δέος. <The doc-

trine holds to-day.. Big guns are the Poundtexts>. Sparta
and Athens for a time; Sparta or Athens as a rule. Thuky-
dides understood the strength and the weakness of both. The
command of the sea was a necessity for Athens. He indulged
in no dreams of imperial conquest for Athens. He could have
been satisfied with Perikles' sphere of influence. Dreams are
only for those who have the power to make the visions reali-
ties. Alkibiades was not an Alexander. Thukydides was no
Panhellenist. <That was reserved for the renegade Xenophon
(A. J. P. XXVI 490). Thukydides was as good an Athenian
as Pindar a Boeotian. To Thukydides an Athenian was an
Athenian always. No wonder that Thukydides always, like
Athens, kept his eye on Corinth—the old mole (A. J. P.
XXVIII 356), the old layer of political mines.>

On the influence of Sophistic on the style of Thukydides
NESTLE touches but lightly, and as this is the burden of LAMB'S
Clio Enthroned (Cambridge, *University Press*)—the rather
affected title of a volume dedicated to the study, or, if you
choose, vindication of Thukydides as an artist—I may take up
the subject in a future *Brief Mention.* Of course, *more
Teutonico,* NESTLE's article is garnished with references to the
literature and larded with proof-texts. I have imitated him by
citing the Journal. The Thukydidean scholar will not be im-
pressed with the novelty of all his views. NESTLE's essay be-
longs to the class of papers for which the world owes so much to
the *Neue Jahrbücher* with their wide outlook for the general
reader and their pregnant hints for the specialist. I trust that
my rapid summary and my ungracious asides have not done
injustice to an estimable scholar and to a valuable periodical.

In the Michaelmas semester of 1850 the illustrious Boeckh
was lecturing on the History of Greek Literature, and when
he came to Sotades, he paused to remark that some people
looked upon the universe from the point of view of sexual
love; and then he went on to tell us with evident relish the
jest that got Sotades into trouble with Ptolemy Philadelphus.
It was not a proper joke, and yet an appropriate one, for ac-
cording to popular etymology the German 'Zote' comes from
the Greek Sotades. In this year of grace not some people,
but all people, deal in sexualities. The God of the Garden
has displaced Max Müller's sun-god. In 1850 Payne Knight
was still held up as a man of impure mind because he saw the
phallus everywhere in the universe, as he saw the digamma
everywhere in Homer. Now everybody seems to be a devotee
of Tree-Worship and Serpent-Worship. There are no re-
serves, and I do not see why I should keep back any longer

an outline or at least an adumbration of my sexual system of the cases (XXXV 109), about which I have had to undergo some good-natured banter. Of course, as I am an old-fashioned man, I must leave the details to be worked out by those who are better equipped both with knowledge and courage.

———

It is not only yesterday and the day before that I have expressed my dissatisfaction with the scientific methods that have been in vogue since the advent of Delbrück, who took up the clue dropped by Quintilian; and I find no more repose to-day than I did a generation ago (A. J. P. II 83 foll.). The mixed cases are still mixed cases; and it is often impossible to tell which element preponderates in this or that use, all the uses being endowed with metaphysical names—most of which the Greek man in the street would not have understood. No system of the cases could be devised that would transcend the nonsense that has been gravely put forth on the general subject, and not only put forth but accepted. Think, for instance, of the utter absurdity of calling the dative a grammatical case. I lifted my ineffectual toe against it many years ago, and shortly after Whitney came down upon it with his merciless heel. And yet this same Whitney yielded to the temptation of making the accusative a 'whither' case. The local theory is anything but simple, anything but convincing. 'Where' has the murderous habit of killing 'whither'. It has actually exterminated 'whither' in spoken English, and in Spanish the place of 'whither' has been usurped by its opposite 'whence'. Never shall I forget the charming naïveté of the old romance:

Rey de mi alma y desta tierra conde,
¿Porqué me dejas, donde vas, en donde?

Why, instruments of precision are installed in modern vessels in order to determine the direction of sounds, so unsatisfactory is the operation of the human ear. Locality is secondary— not primary. These same localists suffered from an embarrassment of riches when they attacked the problem of the nominative. If the genitive is a whence-case, what is the nominative? A whence-case also. And now comes Van Wijk (A. J. P. XXIII 235) and reinforces Streitberg in maintaining that the original genitive singular is a nominative, differing from the nominative only by a tentacular accent which fastens on the word it wants after the fashion set forth by George Bernard Shaw. The whole moral make-up of the genitive is feminine. It leans, it clings, it twines. Put it at the head of a sentence—as one should say a club—far from its natural régime, and it becomes what they call nowadays a 'bachelor maid'—haply a suffragette, haply a free lover. Looked at from this point of view the genitive absolute ceases to be a

mystery, and the syntactical progress in loose behaviour is a chapter in the emancipation of woman. The grammatico-rhetorical tradition of ὀρθός (opp. to ὕπτιος) and ὀρθότης sufficiently vindicates the masculinity of the nominative.

The dative, so far from being a grammatical case, is often an ungrammatical case. It flits over a sentence and takes its good where it finds it. It is, to be brief, a φιλότητι μιγῆναι case—masculine or feminine, or both. Dr. Fennell heaped scorn upon me for saying that μιγῆναι in Pindar always has its rights of <personal> contact, and he declined to put κεκραμένον in the same category (P. 5, 2). He is hopelessly wrong. The accusative is not a whither case. It is simply the result of an action. 'To make port', 'to make land', shew the nexus. Now, Johannes Schmidt has taught us that there is no neuter in language. 'It' is simply indeterminate. τέκνον, the result of the action of οἱ τεκόντες, is differentiated later in ὁ παῖς and ἡ παῖς. Pseudo-Galen asks εἰ ζῷον τὸ κατὰ γαστρός. It was a moot point. But I have written of the mysterious *Es* before (A. J. P. XXV 112). The nominative then is the point of departure, the positive pole. The genitive is the door, the Daleth of the Semites, the delta of the Greeks, the deep well of love (A. J. P. XXV 229), the place within which, the place from within which, emerges the tide of life. The dative is that which gives and takes (Pindar O. 13, 29). The accusative is the resultant, the other pole of activity.

As for the trifling objection that all the four cases under discussion assume masculine or feminine gender, no determined theorist will be balked by that. This assumption of gender belongs to a later period of development. Besides, Brugmann's masterly treatment of grammatical gender has minimized the sexuality of the noun. We must come down from our philosophical altitudes. Too many grammarians are like Renan's Eastern sage, whose name being interpreted means οὗ τὸ σπέρμα εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνέβη: and we must utter the Aristophanic cry κατάβα, κατάβα, κατάβα, κατάβα. But will the response come, καταβήσομαι? However, I am forgetting another κατάβα, the κατάβα addressed to Xanthias by Dionysos, as to a grammarian mounted on his hobby, κατάβα πανοῦργε. But, for all that, there is a good omen in the words that follow:

> καὶ γὰρ ἐγγὺς τῆς θύρας
> ἤδη βαδίζων εἰμὶ τῆσδ', οἳ πρῶτά με
> ἔδει τραπέσθαι.

In his Man and Superman George Bernard Shaw represents his cultured American as still in the Matthew Arnold stage. That stage is long overpast even on this side. Perhaps the restoration of 'sweetness and light' to Dean Swift, the fatiguing reiteration of Arnold's pet phrases, may have some-

thing to do with it, but I still cling to one of his more or less
happy turns, which I used in the Preface to my Essays and
Studies (1890) and expect to use to the end. The attitude of
' Oriental detachment ' is one that I sedulously observe towards
all my performances, but more especially towards the school-
books of which I was guilty more than forty years ago. The
maledictions showered upon my Latin Grammar in the begin-
ning continue to drizzle upon me even in these latter times, as
if it were not curse enough for a man of my temperament
and early aspirations, to be known chiefly as a schoolboy's
Aeacus (A. J. P. XXIII 3). And not only so, but I am de-
barred the privilege of disporting myself in *Brief Mention* at
the expense of those who seem to be pillars in Latin Grammar
lest perchance I might be thought to be pleading a lost cause
—a familiar function for me. Every now and then, however,
I take up a Latin school-book and examine the references in
order to find out wherein the Gildersleeve-Lodge Grammar
falls short of the higher standards of to-day. True, I have
protested by precept and example against the practice of dis-
figuring books by references to grammars which the fewest
will take the pains to consult (A. J. P. XXVI 111), but I am
glad to find that I myself can make practical use of these ugly
sigla. Now, the latest school-edition that has come into my
hands is the *Andria* of Professor STURTEVANT (N. Y., A. B.
Co.), in which references are made to seven of the Latin
Grammars most in use. To judge by these references no
new observation has been made in the last twenty years, the
Gildersleeve-Lodge Grammar having appeared in 1894, for the
Gildersleeve-Lodge book is represented as meeting every con-
tingency, so that one draws the conclusion that the important
thing is not the fact, but the grammarian's interpretation of
the fact. At one point, however, the twenty year old book is
not cited—v. 303 : Tu si hic sis, aliter sentias, an example of
the Early Latin construction of the present subjunctive, where
according to later usage, we should expect the imperfect sub-
junctive. It is a phenomenon of especial interest to the
Grecian who got up the grammar, because it has a parallel in
Homeric usage, for Homer, as Professor Goodwin was the
first to point out, does not use the unreal indicative conditional
of the present. Nor did the Grecian overlook the Latin phe-
nomenon either in 1872 (598 R. 2) or in 1894 (596 R.). In
both editions the Terentian passage is quoted, and a translation
given which serves to mediate the two subjunctives. It is
rather curious that the most Greek of the Latin elegiac poets,
Tibullus, uses *ni sint* (i, 4, 64) as one should say for *ni essent*.
Here too the imperative sense of the mood is the key to
the situation. By the way, I did not use a single verse
from Tibullus in my original Latin Grammar—not because I

had not read Tibullus, for at one time I studied him closely
in a copy of Dissen's ed. which once belonged to Gottfried
Hermann (and was as good as new when I bought it)—but
because Tibullus was not rhetorical enough for my purpose,
though in the Prosody two of the elegiac distichs are from
him.   For a different reason I did not cite Persius.   Madvig
quotes Cicero de Finibus and Livy too often.   Such a proced-
ure smacks of the editor.   And so I sit in my cave and let the
pilgrims to the Heavenly City go by.   Whenever I rouse my-
self, I rouse susceptibilities.   So, f. i., I have received angry
expostulations against an irrefragable statement that 'futurus
esse' in a paradigm is an unpardonable solecism (A. J. P.
XXXII 241), and in defiance of my dictum a recent much-
lauded grammar teaches the boys to say *audiens esse*.   In the
same manual the genitive of material is set down as a regular
category.   It is regular in Greek, but in Latin?   Relatively
infrequent, says Bennett (E. L. II 12), and disputed to boot.
My friend and colleague, Professor Mustard, has set us all to
reading Sannazaro.   How in the world did those old worthies
steer clear of the mines that blow up so many of the Latinists
of 1914?

Apropos of grammars and syntaxes Krueger's Greek Gram-
mar is a mirror of his life.   The quarrel with his wife, his
wrangle with the world, made themselves felt in the examples
which he gathered from his Greek authors, and when the ex-
amples did not fit, he altered them to suit his mood—and
fooled the men who copied him blindly.   This was made
known to me when I was a student in Berlin sixty odd years
ago and it lent a new interest to a book, which gave me my
first interest in syntax, and I sometimes wonder how many
suspect that there is a human document in a schoolbook
that came into the world shortly after the great conflict
of the Civil War, out of which the author, who was not a mere
compiler, emerged, crippled in body, shattered in fortune, with
teeth set hard to meet the stress of fate, his eyes wet with
tears for his fallen comrades ; and yet with the gleam of a new
love reflected in their depths.   In the examples of my Latin
Grammar of 1867 lies perdu the history of that period of my life.
The first page of the Syntax shows my attitude towards the Civil
War by a quotation from Ovid, < Non > tam | turpe fuit vinci quam
contendisse decorum est (A. J. P. XXXV 234), and the poet of
love is accountable for many examples of a different kind.   The
book is a breviary of love.   My friend, Professor March, used
to say that Hamlet belonged to Shakespeare's earlier period by
reason of the large part that love plays in the drama, and
anyone interested in the story of my life might recognize my

state of mind in the many quotations from Ovid and Propertius.   If the period of disillusionment should ever come, I said to myself, Krueger is at hand.

I was present at the twenty-fifth meeting of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies in 1904—for me, at least, a memorable occasion.   The longest address was by Professor John Williams White, in which he told the story of his palaeographical travels and his studies in the manuscripts of Aristophanes—those studies by which he has made for himself an imperishable name among Aristophanic scholars, who with one accord have yielded to him abundant tribute in accepting his classifications and testifying to his painstaking accuracy. As he spoke, my thoughts went back to my master, Ritschl, and I compared his experiences in the Ambrosian library at Milan (A. J. P. V 348) with the similar trials of Professor White in the Vatican: " It requires strength and resolution ", he said, " to continue this work day after day under the conditions imposed by the place.   The hours are short, and one is tempted to work too rapidly ; the place is sometimes uncomfortable—the Vatican collating-room, for example, is so cold in January as to give one a new conception of the Roman Catholic Purgatory —and the man who collates grows weary, in spite of himself, and like Homer may fall to nodding, with consequences that are disastrous ".   In the course of his talk Professor White gave some specimens of his discoveries, and if the outcome seemed disproportionate to the immense labor, the critical edition of Aristophanes that is to come will doubtless outrank all critical editions of any classic identified with an American name.   It is not surprising, then, that in the Introduction to his new edition of *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (Oxford, Clarendon Press), Mr. ELLIOTT acknowledges his obligations to Professor White, and almost apologizes for anticipating the publication of his text.   The title of Mr. ELLIOTT's edition challenges attention—*The Acharnians of Aristophanes: Edited from the MSS. and Other Original Sources*—and it was my purpose to write an elaborate review of his book, for the Acharnians is an especial favorite of mine—partly because I feel myself better prepared to judge of Aristophanes' cruder work—and to that end I caused one of my seminary students, Miss SHIELDS, to collate Mr. ELLIOTT's text with the Hall and Geldart edition.   The result was disillusioning in the extreme, and for the present at all events, I am constrained to acquiesce in Mr. BEARE's judgment as expressed in the last number of Hermathena: " Mr. ELLIOTT's vast industry has not enabled him to make even one certain and valuable restoration, or suggested to him a single brilliant emendation "

8

This exactness in the handling of manuscript evidence may be set down as what Hegel calls 'ein Produkt der sich selbst denkenden Zeit'. It goes with photography, it goes with instruments of precision; and no wonder that those who excel in it see in it more than the perfect command of material, of which we have another exemplification in statistical methods. In his *Recent Developments of Textual Criticism*, A. C. CLARK, the eminent editor of Cicero, cites with emphatic approval the dictum of Robinson Ellis that 'during the last thirty years all, or nearly all, the principal contributions to an enlarged knowledge of Greek and Latin authors has been based on an investigation of a minute and laborious kind unknown before'.

> Und ach ! entrollst du gar ein würdig Pergamen,
> So steigt der ganze Himmel zu dir nieder.

But the exhaustive mastery of the evidence does not constitute a *Novum Organon*. After as before the requirement of absolute accuracy, the need of penetrating intellect abides. Reiske was a manuscript in himself. Everything depends on the way in which the minutiae are combined, and one is tempted to adapt the old schoolmaster's joke and say: ΔΕΙ <ΟΡΓΑΝΟΥ> ΚΑΙΝΟΥ (καὶ νοῦ).

G. L. H.: The most recent volume of the *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittlealters* (München, 1914) keeps up the standard of the earlier volumes. PAUL LEHMANN, the general editor of the series, gives an interesting study of twenty-five pages on the use of the term " Middle Ages ", and the development of the scholarly conception of the study of medieval philology. The greater part of the volume is devoted to what is, in substance, a supplement to the classical edition of Jacques de Vitry's Exempla of Professor T. F. Crane. The latter only referred to the manuscripts of the *Sermones communes*, which were to be found recently in Belgian libraries. Two editions of the exempla in these manuscripts appeared last year in Germany, one in Winter's *Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte*, edited by Dr. Josef Greven, the other, the one in hand, the work of Dr. GOSWIN FRENKEN, which is superior on account of the long introduction on the general use of exempla, and the source of de Vitry's stories (1–87). There is plenty of occasion for comment on two subjects covering such a wide field, but the correction of a few omissions and mistakes will suffice here. In the account of the use of exempla in antiquity (5 ff.), there is

no reference to the best that has been already written on the subject by H. Peter (*Wahrheit und Kunst, Geschichtschreibung und Plagiat im klassisch. Altertum,* 162 ff., 169), and E. Stemplinger (*Das Plagiat in der griechisch. Literatur,* 223 ff.). The date of the composition of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Secretum Secretorum* is not about 1300 (78); the Latin translation of this Arabic work was made a century earlier, as is shown by the use made of it in the *Liber physiognomiae* of Michael Scot, to whom Dr. FRENKEN wishes to deny the authorship of the *Mensa philosophica* which cites the *Secretum* frequently. It has also escaped his attention that de Vitry gives (128) from his personal experience, and with monkish acidity, an account of a French practice, anterior by a century and a half, to the allusion to the Dunmow flitch of bacon in *Piers Ploughman,* the earliest instance of the custom that has been pointed out. Then, again, Dr. FRENKEN has not pointed out that de Vitry has only given a monastic setting (140–1) to the story of the father who deceived his ungrateful sons by the use of chests containing stones (cf. Knowles, *Folk Tales of Kashmir,* 241; J. Geffcken, *Der Bildercatechismus des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts,* 71; Herbert, *Cat. of Romances,* 486, 653).

R. V. D. M.: Professor Barbagallo's name appears with increasing frequency on monographs which deal with various phases of classical history. His latest work [Un Semestre d'Impero Repubblicano. Il governo di Galba (giugno, 68–15 gennaio, 69) Napoli, 1914. Pp. 89.] is a pamphlet on the emperor Galba. There is not much that is new in this presentation, and the author has not been able to refrain from giving overmuch prominence to the latterly lurid career of Nero. He has confined himself to a comprehensive and comparative examination of the literary evidence and has made a very neat summary, not without flashes of inspiration and clever turns of phrase, of six months of a time quite entirely " out of joint ".

Professor Barbagallo makes it quite clear that Galba came to the throne with high ideals, but that he was not able to reconcile to himself the establishment of high ideals by high-handed means. He sent his own soldiers away, which was foolish; he did not give largesses to the praetorians, which was fatuous; and he announced as his successor a young and untried man, which was futile; and so he was killed before he had evinced any inclination to try to get into touch with the times.

This monograph is another of its author's many carefully

written sketches which treat of short periods in Roman imperial history. Professor Barbagallo is probably publishing chapters of a projected book.

It must be said, however, that there is not much to be gleaned in the field of literary sources. It is to epigraphy and numismatics that the Roman historian is turning now for new material. Professor Barbagallo will be interested in an article soon to be published by an American woman who by her study of coins has cleared up several matters hitherto in dispute regarding the years 68–70 A. D.

———

F. E.: Not only Indologists, but all persons interested in folk-psychology and cultural history, should welcome the publication by Dr. VON NEGELEIN of *Jagaddeva's Svapnacintāmaṇi* ("Der Traumschlüssel des Jagaddeva", Giessen, 1912). The painstaking and industrious editor has not contented himself with publishing a critical text with careful translation of this, perhaps the most important of Hindu treatises on dreams. This in itself would have been a valuable work, and by no means an easy one, for—as the editor complains, p. XVIII— the language of the text is often purposely obscure, and corruptions are not rare. But he has enriched his work and greatly increased its value by a wealth of parallels from other Indian sources (enumerated p. XIX), contained in voluminous notes which seem pretty well to justify the claim (p. XX): Das Gegebene genügt vollauf, die Kenntnis des indischen Traumaberglaubens dem Indologen wie auch dem Religionsforscher zu erschliessen. It is to be regretted that Dr. VON NEGELEIN did not add to the book an alphabetical index to the first lines of stanzas contained in his book: this would have made its use as a book of handy reference easier. I have tried in a small way to test the completeness of the collection of materials by looking up in the *Traumschlüssel* the verses on dreams found in the Vikramacarita (a work not used by VON NEGELEIN), which number about ten. Four of them I find quoted word for word, though they do not occur in the *Svapnacintāmaṇi* itself, from parallel texts[1]: and there are close parallels for the ideas contained in all the others, with one exception. This exception is all the more surprising because it is the only verse in the Vikr. which is definitely stated to be a quotation from a "book of dreams" (*svapnādhyāya*), and yet I have failed to find not only the verse itself, but any ref-

———

[1] On account of the lack of an index of first lines mentioned above, I cannot be sure that I have not overlooked the occurrence of some others.

erence to any similar conception in VON NEGELEIN. The verse is the following (Southern Recension 4. 6):

devo dvijo gurur gāvaḥ pitaro liṅginas tathā
yad vadanti vacaḥ svapne tat tathāiva vinirdiçet.

Which may be freely translated: One should resolve to follow strictly the advice, given in a dream, by a god, a brahman, a teacher, cows, ancestors and bearers of *liṅgas.*—Of course, Dr. VON NEGELEIN cannot be blamed for not printing what his text does not contain, and these remarks are not intended as in any way a reflection on his admirable and highly important work. But this chance find of mine may perhaps be taken to indicate that in spite of the richness of his collection, there may remain phases of the dream-superstition in India which it happens not to touch upon.—An index of words found in the *Svapnacintāmaṇi* itself, and a systematic *Inhaltsverzeichniss,* help to make the book usable.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30–32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Benn (Alf. W.) The Greek philosophers. 2d ed., corrected and partly rewritten. New York, *Dutton.* 619 pp. 8°, $6 net.

British School at Athens: Annual, No. 19. Session 1912–1913. London, 1914. 4°, 1.5. £ net.

Chickering (E. C.) and Hoadley (H.) Beginners' Latin by the direct method. New York, *Scribner,* 1914. 108 + 140 pp. pls. 12°, pupil's ed. 75 c. net; teacher's ed. $1 net.

Hodges (C. E.) A Latin Note Book. 4°. 136 pp. *Cambridge University Press.* 2s.

Livy. Books I, XXI, and XXII; with brief introd. and commentary and numerous il., by Emory B. Lease. New York, *Heath,* 1914. 390 pp. pls., maps, plans. 12° (Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin ser.) $1.25 net.

—— Ab urbe condita; liber III; ed. with introd. and notes by P. Thoresby Jones. New York, *Oxford University Press,* 1914. 281 pp. 12°, 90 c. net.

Loeb Classical Library. New York, *Macmillan,* 1914. ea. $1.50 net; in leather, $2.

    Caesar. The civil wars; with an English tr. by A. G. Peskett. New York, *Macmillan,* 1914. 10 + 369 pp. por. maps. 16°.

    Dio (Cassius). Roman history; with an English tr. by Ernest Cary, on the basis of the version of Herb. Baldwin Foster. In 9 v. v. 3. New York, *Macmillan,* 1914. 7 + 519 pp. 16°.

    Ovid. Heroides and Amores; with an English tr. by Grant Showerman. New York, *Macmillan,* 1914. 7 + 523 pp. 16°.

    Plutarch's lives; with an English tr. by Bernadotte Perrin. In 10 v. vs. 1 and 2. New York, *Macmillan,* 1914. 19 + 582; 9 + 630 pp. 16°.

    Procopius; with an English tr. by H. B. Denring. In 6 v. v. 1, History of the wars; bks. 1, 2. New York, *Macmillan,* 1914. 15 + 583 pp. 16°.

    Xenophon. Cyropædia; with an English tr. by Wa. Miller. In 2 v. v. 2. New York, *Macmillan,* 1914. 5 + 478 pp. 16°.

Lucretius. The nature of things. New York, *Macmillan.* 20 + 267 pp. 16°, (Bohn popular lib.) 35 c. net.

Map (Wa.) De nugis curialium; ed. by M. R. James. New York,

Oxford University Press. 39 + 228 pp. 8°. (Anecdota Oxoniensia) $6 net.

Plato. The Apology of Socrates. Ed. by Adela M. Adam. 8°, 130 pp. *Cambridge University Press.* 2s. 6d.

Plutarch, Plutarch's lives. 2 v. New York, *Macmillan.* 32 + 463 pp. 16° (Bohn popular lib.), ea., 35 c. net.

—— Plutarch's lives; for boys and girls; being selected lives freely retold by W. H. West; with 16 drawings in col. by W. Rainey. New York, *Stokes.* 9 + 360 pp, pls. 8°, $1.50 net.

Thallon (Ida C.) Readings in Greek history. Boston, *Ginn,* 1914. 29 + 638 pp. (bibls.) 8°, $2.

Wright (Jos.) and Wright (Mrs. E. M. L.) Old English grammar. 2d. ed. New York, *Oxford University Press.* 15 + 362 pp. 12°, $2 net.

FRENCH.

Boissier (G.) L'Opposition sous les Césars; par Gaston Boissier de l'Académie française. Nouvelle édition. *Hachette et Cie,* 1913. 16°. 3.50 fr.

Cicéron, Dialogue sur l'amitié. Expliqué littéralement, traduit en français et annoté par A. Legouez. Paris, *Hachette & Cie,* 1914. 16°. 1.25 fr.

Epictète, Manuel d'Epictète. Traduction française; par François Thurot revue par Charles Thurot, membre de l'Institut. Paris, *Hachette & Cie.* 16°. 1 fr.

Horace. Edition classique par l'abbé J. B. Lechatellier. *J. de Gigord.* 16°. 2.

Inscriptiones graecae ad res Romanes pertinentes. Tomus quartus. Fasc. 5. curavit R. Cagnat auxiliante G. Lafaye. Paris, *E. Leroux,* 1914. Grand. 8°.

Louys (P.) Aphrodite, moeurs antiques. Avec un frontispice gravé sur bois. Par P. E. Vibert. Paris, *Georges Crès et Cie,* 1914. 8°.

Platon, Le Banquet, ou De l'amour de Platon. Traduction intégrale et nouvelle suivie des commentaires de Plotin sur l'Amour, avec avant-propos, prolégomènes et notes; par Mario Meunier. Paris, *Payot et Cie,* 1914. 18°. 3.50 fr.

Roussel (A.) La Religion dans Homère. Paris, *Jean Maisonneuve et fils.* 8°.

GERMAN.

Aeschyli tragoediae, ed. Udalricus de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, (xxxv, 382 S. m. 3 Lichtdr.-Taf.). gr. 8°. Berolini, 1914. Berlin. *Weidmann.* 14.

Dioscuridis, Pedanii, Anazarbei de materia medica libri quinque ed. Max Wellmann. Vol. III quo continentur liber V. Crateuae, Sextii Nigri fragmenta, Dioscuridis liber de simplicibus. (vi, 393 S.) gr. 8°. Berolini, 1914. Berlin, *Weidmann.* 15.

Draheim (H.)   Die Ilias als Kunstwerk.   (III, 119 S.)   8°.   Münster, *Aschendorff*. 1914.   1.60.

Favre (Christophor.)   Thesaurus verborum, quae in titulis ionicis leguntur cum Herodoteo sermone comparatus.   (445 S.)   gr. 8°.   Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1914.   14.

Graef (Botho).   Die antiken Vasen v. der Akropolis zu Athen, Unter Mitwirkg. v. Paul Hartwig, Paul Wolters u. Rob. Zahn veröffentlicht.   3. Heft.   Text u. Tafel-Tl.   (S. 157–203 m. Abbildgn. u. 13 Taf.)   40,5 × 28,5 cm.   Berlin, *G. Reimer*, 1914.   geh. u. geb. in Halbleinw. b nn 20.

Heynacher (Max).   Beiträge zur zeitgemässen Behandlung der lateinischen Grammatik auf statistischer Grundlage.   2. Aufl.   (55 S.)   gr. 8°.   Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914.   1.60.

Historicorum romanorum reliquiae, Iteratis curis disposuit, recensuit, praefatus est Hermann. Peter.   Vol. I.   (Neue Ausg.)   (x, CCCLXXX, 382 S.)   gr. 8°.   Lipsiae, 1914.   Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.   22; geb. 25.

Horatius Flaccus (Q.)   Erklärt. v. Adf. Kiessling.   3. Tl.: Briefe. 4. Aufl., bearb. v. Rich. Heinze.   (v. 365 S.)   8°.   Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914.   3.60.

Methner (Rud.)   Lateinische Syntax des Verbums.   (xii, 219 S.)   8. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914.   6.

Monumenta palaeographica.   Denkmäler der Schreibkunst des Mittelalters.   1. Abtlg.   Schrifttafeln in lateinischer und deutscher Sprache. Herausgegeben von Ant. Chroust.   II. Serie.   17. Lfg.   München, 1914. Fol.   9 (1 Doppel-) Lichtdr.-Taf. u. 34 Bl. u. pp. Text mit Abbildgn. u. 1 weiteren Taf.   20 m.

Petersen (Pet.)   Goethe u. Aristoteles.   (iv, 58 S.)   gr. 8°.   Braunschweig, *G. Westermann*, 1914.   1.25.

Rüsch (Edm.)   Grammatik der delphischen Inschriften.   1. Bd. Lautlehre.   (XXII, 344 S.)   gr. 8°.   Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914.   13.

Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, hrsg. v. Alfons Hilka.   8°. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*.   8. Salomon et Marcolfus.   Kritischer Text m. Einleitg., Anmerkgn., Uebersicht üb. die Sprüche, Namen- u. Wörterverzeichnis, hrsg. v. Walt. Benary.   (xl, 56 S.)   1914.   1.80.   9. Jakob v. Vitry, Des, Exempla aus den Sermones feriales et communes, hrsg. v. Jos. Greven.   (xix, 68 S.)   1914.   1.60.

Smits (J. C. P.)   Die Vita Commodi u. Cassius Dio.   Eine quellenanalyt. Untersuchg.   (viii, 108 S.)   gr. 8.   Leiden, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill*, 1914.   3 nn.

Sophokles.   Erklärt v. F. W. Schneidewin u. A. Nauck.   6. Bdchn.: Trachinierinnen.   7. Aufl.   Neue Bearbeitg. v. Ludw. Radermacher. (186 S.)   8°.   Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914.   2.

Stählin (Frdr.)   Pharsalos.   Topographische u. geschichtl. Untersuchgn. üb. die Hauptstadt der Phthiotis.   Progr.   (24 S. m. 6 Abbildgn. auf 2 [1 farb.] Taf.)   gr. 8°.   Nürnberg, *J. L. Schrag*, 1914.   1.

Sudhaus (Siegfr.)   Menanderstudien.   (vii, 94 S.)   gr. 8°.   Bonn, *A. Marcus & E. Weber*, 1914.   4.

Wassmer (J.) Beiträge zur Antigone-Erklärung. Progr. (51 S.) gr. 8°. Luzern, *Räber & Co.*, 1914 1.

Wessely (C.) Die ältesten lateinischen und griechischen Papyri Wiens. Aus Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde. Leipzig, 1914. 4°. 4 pp. Mit 14 Lichtdr.-Taf. 10 m.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulr. v.: Aischylos. Interpretationen. (v, 260 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. 8.

ITALIAN.

Casini (Tommaso). Studi di poesia antica. Città di Castello, 16°. 6.

Papiri greci e latini. Vol. III (N. 157–279). Firenze, 4°, p. 176, con una tavola. 25.

Sabbadini Remigio. Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci nei secoli XIV e XV. Firenze, 8°, p. VIII, 274. 5.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aeschyli Tragoediae. Ed. Udalricus de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Berolini, *apud Weidmannos* (Accedunt tabulae tres), 1914. 14 m.

Aischylos, Interpretationen von Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung,* 1914. 8 m.

American Magazine. January, 1915. 15 c.

Art and Archaeology. An Illustrated Magazine. Vol. I, No. 4, January, 1915. Baltimore. 25 c. $2 per annum.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Τόμος κά, Τεῦχος α' β'. Ἀθήνησιν. 1914.

Beowulf with the Finnsburg Fragment. Edited by A. J. Wyatt. New Edition revised with Introduction and Notes by R. W. Chambers. Cambridge, *At the University Press.* New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons,* 1914.

Conciliatore (Il). (La "Cultura" di R. Bonghi). Direttore: G. A. Borgese. Anno I. Fascicolo 3°-4°. Torino, *Fratelli Bocca,* 1914. L. 3.

Dean (L. R.) Index to Facsimiles in the Palaeographical Society Publications. Princeton, *The University Library,* 1914. $1.

Dihigo (Juan M.) El Habla Popular al través de la Literatura Cubana. Publicado en la "Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias". Habana, 1915.

Eastern and Western Review. November, December, 1914; January, February, 1915. Ed. by T. T. Timayensis. Boston, Mass. @ 20 c.

Gehman (H. S.) The Interpreters of Foreign Languages Among the Ancients (University of Pennsylvania Diss.). Lancaster, Penn., *Intelligence Printing Co.,* 1914.

Hamilton (George L.) Storm-making Springs: Rings of Invisibility and Protection. Studies on the Sources of the Yvain of Chrétien de Troies. Romanic Review, Vol. V, No. 3.

Harrison (Fairfax). The School of Hellas. An Address before the Virginia Classical Association. Nov. 21, 1914.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XXV. Cambridge (Mass.), *Harvard University Press,* 1914.

Havet (Louis). Notes critiques sur le texte de Festus. Paris, *Edouard Champion,* 1914.

Heidel (W. A.) Hippocratea I. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XXV, 1914.

Hermes, Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. Carl Robert u. Robert Wissowa. XLIX. Band. 4. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmann,* 1914.

Hertel (Johannes). Das Pañçatantra, seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung. Gekrönte Preisschrift. Leipzig u. Berlin, 1914. 25 m.

Hesperia. Schriften zur germanischen Philologie herausg. von Hermann Collitz. No. 5: Mixed Preterites in German by O. P. Rein. 4.60 m. No. 7: The Attitude of Gustav Freytag and Julian Schmidt toward English Literature (1848–1862). 3.60 m. Ergänzungsreihe: Schriften zur englischen Philologie unter Mitwirkung von Herm. Collitz herausg. v. James W. Bright. 3. Heft.: The Drama of Lord Byron. A Critical Study. By Samuel C. Chew, Jr. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht.* Baltimore, *The Johns HopkinsPress,* 1915. 6 m.

Hogg (William Charles). Baptism. Two Lectures. Williamsport, Penn. (Privately Printed.) 25 c.

Jordanes, The Gothic History of. In English Version with an Introduction and a Commentary. By Charles Christopher Mierow. Princeton, *Princeton University Press.* London, *Humphreys.* New York, *Oxford University Press,* 1915.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXXIV. Part 2. 1914. London, *Macmillan & Co.*

Menandri Reliquiae nuper repertae. Iterum ed. Siegfried Sudhaus. Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber,* 1914. 2 m.

Menanderstudien von Siegfried Sudhaus. Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber.* 4 m.

Merrill (Elmer Truesdell). Execution of a Vestal and Ritual Marriage. Reprinted from Classical Philology, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Jan. 1913. On Cic. Fam. xv. 20, Verg. (?) Catal. 10, and Ventidius. Vol. VIII, No. 4, October, 1913. Vol. IX, No. 3, July, 1914. The Tradition of Pliny's Letters. Vol. X, No. 1, Jan. 1915. On Cicero to Basilus (Fam. VI. 15).

Merrill (W. A.) Proposed Emendations of Lucretius. University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 2, No. 12, Dec. 19, 1914.

Mnemosyne. Bibliotheca philologica Batava. Collegerunt P. H. Damsté, J. J. Hartman, C. W. Vollgraff. Nova Series. Vol. XLII. Pars. II. Lugduni-Batavorum, *E. J. Brill.* Lipsiae, *O. Harrassowitz,* 1915.

National Academy of Sciences, Proceedings of. Vol. I, No 1, January, 1915.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Joh. Ilberg u. Paul Cauer. XVII/XVIII. Jahrg. XXIII. u. XXXIV. Bandes 3/4/5/10. Heft. XXXV. u. XXXVI. Bandes. 1. Heft. Leipzig-Berlin, *B. G. Teubner,* 1014/1915.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Sechzehnter Jahrg. Nr. 7/8. Helsingfors, 1914.

Ogle (M. B.) Further Notes on Classical Tradition. Modern Language Notes, December, 1914.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray.

SPEECH–SPRIG. By W. A. Craigie. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Oxford University Press* (H. Milford). $1.25.

Pease (A. S.)   Medical Allusions in the Works of St. Jerome.   Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXV, 1914.

Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei de Materia Medica Libri Quinque. Ed. Max Wellmann. Vol, III. Quo Continentur Liber V. Crateuae, Sextii Nigri Fragmenta, Dioscuridis Liber de Simplicibus. Berolini, *Ap. Weidmannos*, MCMXIV. 15 m.

Plautus. Five of his Plays. Translated into English verse by Sir Robert Allinson. London, *Arthur L. Humphreys*, 187 Piccadilly, W., 1914. 7s. 6d.

Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904–1905 and 1909, Publications of the. Division II : Ancient Architecture in Syria, by Howard Crosby Butler. Division III : Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria, by William Kelly Prentice. Section B : Northern Syria ; Part 5 : The Djebel Halakah. Leyden, *Late E. J. Brill.* 1914.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Noviembre de 1914 ; Enero de 1915. Vols. IX/X, Núms. 3/1.   Universidad de la Habana.

Revue Celtique. Vol. XXXV. No. 3. Paris, *Edouard Champion,* 1914.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. August Brinkmann, N. F. LXX. 1. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer*, 1915.

Rüsch (Edmund). Grammatik der Delphischen Inschriften. I. Band. Lautlehre. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1914. 13 m.

Schlicher (J. J.) The Historical Infinitive. 1. Its Simple Forms. 2. Its Literary Elaborations. 3. Imitation and Decline. Classical Philology, 1913, 1914, 1915.

Sommer (Ferdinand). Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. Zweite und Dritte Aufl. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Abt. Erste Reihe. Grammatiken. Band 3. 1). Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1914. 9 m.

—— Kritische Erläuterungen zur lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. Ebenda, 1914. 4 m.

Studies in Philology. A Quarterly Journal.   Vol. XII, No. 1, 1915. Chapel Hill, *The University of North Carolina.*

Warren (Howard Crosby). Academic Freedom. Reprinted from The Atlantic Monthly, November, 1914.

Wilhelm (Adolf). Pergamener Sonderabrede aus den Athenischen Mitteilungen 1914.